THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1930

THE FOREIGN MISSIONS ENTERPRISE[1]

C. F. SANDERS
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

THERE seems to be a most wholesome uneasiness abroad throughout the whole of our western civilization. We have it from eminent councils that we are headed for the abyss. This does not come from Harry Elmer Barnes or from Oswald Spengler. It is coming from the churchmen. Every church convention is pervaded with lugubrious lamentation. I have not time now to attempt to account for it. It is simply the statement of a general consensus which must serve as my starting point.

Foreign missions are naturally under observation and, perhaps, criticism. There seems to be a failure of funds, which means a failure of interest, to carry on as the apparent needs require. Instead of being surprised at this let us be a little more intelligent and admit that this is what we expected, or it is at least what we should have expected from the prevailing uncertainty in church circles as to what is to become of us. Let us furthermore not commit the ancient folly of seeking a goat upon which reverently to lay the sin-root of this situation and, having disposed of the goat, go on unchanged.

In India I was introduced to an audience I was about to address—the audience was largely Hindu—with the following ter-

1 Read at the Interseminary Movement, Seventh Annual Conference of the Student Association of Middle Atlantic Seminaries, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., Feb. 27-Mar. 1, 1930.

rific characterization: "Dr. Sanders is not a member of any mission board nor is he the commissioner of any such board. He is paying his own bills and hence not disturbed with the question whether somebody back home will be pleased with what he has to say." Frankly, I was disturbed. But the chairman of that meeting knew what he was about. (This took place in a government teacher's college, not in a mission school). The students of my audience gave me the full benefit of the introduction. Their comment afterwards was, "We are fed up on the stuff the men who are paid for what they say are giving us. What we want is what the man himself really stands for and the reason why." Coming from a Hindu, that thrilled me. The reader will understand that that Hindu was not passing any judgment on me. He was expressing a profound appreciation of a fundamental principle of faith and its propagation.

At a mission station I said to the missionary in charge: "I want to make a contribution to foreign missions right here on the field as a sort of thank offering for the splendid inspirations I am enoying. I wish it could be large, but I must respect my limits. The point is that I want to make it on the field." I handed him thirty Rupees with the observation, "There are no strings to it. Use it as you see fit." His reply was, "That will keep three more boys in school for a year." Coming from a missionary, that thrilled me.

In Kioto I had a most inspiring interview with Miss Denton, for fifty years the head of the Doshishi school for girls, of whom I had been informed by the Japanese: "Her life bears witness that she is sent of God. Coming from a Japanese, that thrilled me.

At my second lecture in Guntur Dr. Kugler presided. In beginning my lecture that evening I took occasion to state my ignorance of the meaning of the title of India's great leader the Mahatma and went on to explain that I was beginning to see that it meant Great-souled, as if I were to say Mahatma Kugler. The applause was thunderous. Coming from Indians, the beneficiaries of the life-work of Dr. Kugler, that thrilled me. These thrills came because of the evidence that the unsubsidized still get the response of the heart of humanity.

Now I want to write about the Foreign Missions Enterprise. I conceive it the most ambitious enterprise ever undertaken by man. In speaking of such an enterprise it is impossible to avoid forecast; and prophets have never been popular. If John had gone with the Roman soldiers at sunset on that memorable day when they laid the body of Jesus in Joseph's tomb and said to them that within three short centuries Imperial Rome would enthrone this crucified Nazarene at the head of its religion, he would have been laughed to scorn. If we could have gone to the private office of Constantine in the early years of the fourth century when he issued the edict which made Christianity the official religion of Rome and told him that by that act he was selling out Jesus Christ to Caesar, the astute statesman would have smiled and the bishops would have frowned. But as we see this event now in the perspective of fifteen centuries it looks commonplace. The evolution of the Papacy under the fostering spirit of Imperial Rome was the most natural thing in the world, but it destroyed Christianity. Germany paid for that tragic bargain with the struggle of the Reformation and its resulting Thirty Years' War; France paid for it in the atheism of the seventeenth century and the revolution which overthrew the house of Bourbon together with its subsidized house of bishops; Russia is paying for it now in the crash of the house of Romanoff and the so-called atheism which is repudiating the tyrannous Holy Russian church. Now that these things have happened it seems so simple that we feel that the discerning must have foreseen them.

I have chosen the petition of the Greeks, recorded in the Gospel of John 12:21, "Sirs, we would see Jesus," as our guiding text. It is not my purpose to enter into an exposition of this striking passage, but rather to abstract its inspiration. The ancient Greeks were the most iconoclastic people that ever lived and by the same token the very personification of earnest and honest search after truth. Impelled by this deep yearning for truth and having heard in their far-away home that Judea had produced a Teacher who was solving the deep problems of life, they set out to find him and learn the Way. Questions of race prejudice did not bother them.

Paul was imbued with the same spirit at Tarsus, and on the Damascus road he laid off his provincial Pharisaism and, dedicating himself to preaching Christ, laid the foundations of Christianity throughout the Roman world. Diocletian and Marcus Aurelius tried to put a stop to it by persecution but failed. Constantine was more diplomatic. He bought off the bishops and clothed them with the dignity of an earthly state. The sychophant priesthood played into his hands. Under these conditions it is no wonder that Justinian closed the universities of Athens and Alexandria and postponed scientific achievement for a thousand years. But the Greek petition never died. An Imperial Papacy, equipped with an inquisitorial court, and armed with faggot and rack, was unable to suppress the earnest inquiry, "Sirs, we would see Jesus." The intrepid Dante, in high scorn for the travesty of canonization by which Rome held her purchase on men of power, located some of the men in Hell, whose names have passed into history catalogued as saints. The house of Bourbon and the house of Romanoff learned their statecraft from Caesar and made the priesthood the agents of their infamy and tyranny. Reduced to its common denominator, these atheisms would read: there is no God such as the French Jesuits and the orthodox Russians maintain. And, my friends, there isn't. The Jesus who overthrew the money-changers in the Temple and offered salvation to all on equal terms, denies the existence of the God of French tyranny and of Rasputin. These atheistic revolts are against the statesmanship of Constantine and the resulting sycophant priesthood. Correctly interpreted, these revolts keep alive the Greek petition, "Sirs, we would see Jesus."

But I seem to hear the suppressed whisper, What has all this past history to do with the foreign missions enterprise? The answer is easy. It is the solid background of history that shall justify the forecast I am about to make concerning this ambitious enterprise.

In Peking I learned to my amazement and surprise that in the reign of Louis XIV negotiations had been about completed to make Christianity the official religion of China for the price of the canon-

ization of a line of kings of the Celestial Empire. The scheme failed. In an art museum within the walls of the Forbidden City of old Peking we were shown a collection of royal presents that figured in the negotiations. This reveals more about France than it does about China. The France of Louis XIV regarded Christianity a commodity with which kings could trade. Why not? Had not Constantine done it and been called Great? But that day is past. Trading in Empire has ceased.

I have recounted in outline two thousand years of the failure of Constantine's subsidy in order that I may claim the triumphant power of the spirit of the Greek petition as it has survived these tragedies. Christ never called sycophants; and the sycophants who have professed to be in his service have been his worst enemies. The enterprise of foreign missions has been comparatively free from this blight.

I think I can sketch quite briefly now what the foreign missionary has done. He has gone to alien peoples at the sacrifice of the social comforts. He has adapted himself to strange climates that have made heavy inroads on his vitality. He has established hospitals and schools and pursued his vocation of healing and instruction with patience, and frequently endured persecution without complaint. As Jesus conversed with publican and sinner—aristocrat and commoner—with the affluent and the indigent, so the missionary has gone to the Samurai, the Mandarin, and the Brahman; and he has gone to the Eta, the Coolie and the Untouchable. He has been misunderstood, and he has been an object sometimes of pity, sometimes of contempt, but eventually of wonder and admiration. He has broadcast the news about a Teacher come from God. The news has gripped the imagination of the orient and they have taken up the Greek petition, "Sirs, we would see Jesus." But this is what we should have expected. The founders of missions did expect it. And why shouldn't nations inquire concerning the source of the inspiration of the men and women who come to them to give so much without the thought or the hope of getting. It is the witness of their life that gives the gripping force to their doctrine. Their doctrine has always been as revolutionary as it could

be. It was revolutionary in its social system, its status of woman, its attitude towards children, in its economics and in its politics as well as in its attitude towards physical nature. May I pause to say that the fundamental viewpoint of the religion of the west fosters the scientific spirit. "Subdue the earth," is the injunction of Genesis, and Jesus inculcates the aggressive mastery of physical nature. Oriental religions foster a spirit of submissiveness and acquiescence in Fate, that is subversive of the scientific spirit.

If I may be permitted to state his doctrine in a sweeping generalization, the missionary taught the oriental the fundamental doctrine of Divine Fatherhood and Human Brotherhood, together with man's supremacy over his natural environment. Before these fundamentals, imperialism, caste, fate, and superstition shrivel as the grass before the blast of a desert wind. The missionary taught these doctrines in the name of Jesus and the oriental is now prevailed on to petition on his own behalf, "Sirs, we would see Jesus."

The encouraging thing in the study of the foreign missions enterprise is the fact that the oriental has discovered that Jesus stands above the failures of his people. While the Jews were plotting to destroy him the Greeks were seeking to know him. In Tokio a professor of political science at the Imperial University asked me how we Christians squared our doctrine of human brotherhood with the late World War which embroiled all and only the Christian nations. My reply was, "We don't attempt to square it. We confess that the War was the very subversion of this fundamental doctrine, but we still hold that it is the only doctrine that will heal the wound and, perchance, rebuild a better order."

It is not the doctrine that has failed. Japan is very uncertain whether she wants the western church, but she has welcomed the spiritual program of Jesus. So recently as fifty years ago Christian worship and the distribution of the Scriptures were forbidden in Japan. The missionary had the status of the religious bootlegger. But in 1927 Dr. Henry Sloan Coffin found a member of the Imperial Cabinet a judge of the Superior Court, and the vice mayor of Tokio among the active members of a prominent Christian church. Japan has adopted universal education, abolished the

degradation of the Eta class, adopted a constitution patterned after our own (which has swept away by a stroke of the pen her ancient Shinto doctrine that the Emperor is born of God), and entered the field of scientific research in a fashion that has swiftly brought her into the fellowship of the advancement of science. At the foundations Japan has renounced her Shinto and her Buddhist shrines and she has definitely faced the future in the terms of the principles of a Christ-inspired civilization.

In China the student and traveler finds that the defender of the old regime and the exploiter, both native and foreign, hate the missionary and missions. But it is heartening to the Christian to find that large numbers of the leaders of New China received their training in leadership in the capacity of Y. M. C. A. secretaries. And the reason for the bitterness of the old regime against the missionary is the best tribute to his success. Christianity has taught that man is created in the image of God and that the assumed privilege of the classes to exploit the masses is false. The privilege of the Mandarin against the Coolie is repudiated, and the Mandarin resents it. But sophisticated young China has come out against the Mandarin. On the other hand, Christian missions have been embarrassed by the principle of extra-territorial privileges accorded the foreigner. To the Chinese these are the earmarks of imperialism, and the fact that the missionary enjoys their protection is interpreted to mean that the missionary is an agent of imperialism under the cloak of philanthropy. Just as the Greeks of our text made no inquiry concerning the institutions of Judaism, but were concerned only to see Jesus, so China, especially young China, resents the air of superiority assumed by the West which they have described as the supremacy complex; but they want to know Jesus. An officer of the Nationalist Government remarked to Professor Paul Monroe: "We do not attack Christianity as a religion, but we do attack Christianity as being used as a tool of imperialism." My friends, I insist we are seeing the constant demonstration of the interest of the quest of the Greeks to see Jesus, and by the same token a complete revulsion against the pharisaic institutionalism

that seeks to prostitute his spirit to the selfish purpose of imperial power or alien domination.

China is well on the way towards the reconstruction of her politics and her economics. Universal education is on the near horizon. Her ageold superstitions are going into the discard. She is laying a severe hand on the reactionary. She is taking her patterns from the West. But, and let us note this fact well, she is using her own discriminating judgment and selecting her own patterns. Two thousand years of our western history has furnished the materials and shown both what constitutes the spirit of Jesus and what is the subversion of that spirit. China wants Jesus, but China does not want the thing known as the Holy Roman church which required the Protestant Revolt, nor the sacred order of the Jesuits which required the French Revolution, nor the Holy Russian church which called Bolshevism into existence. No, my friends, China is seeking Jesus, seeking his optimism, his tenderness, his justice, his sense of brotherhood, his self-denial for the redemption of the race, and the missionary who brought this Gospel is revered and welcome still. But for the haughty westerner who comes with the swagger of superiority, his slogan is: "Drive the foreign devils out." As a student in Shanghai remarked: "Those who have the white man's superiority complex; those who are not willing to trust us ought to remain away, now that they have gone." (This when the missionaries were called home).

In India the problem confronting the teacher of Christianity is more complicated, but, nothwithstanding this fact, unmistakable evidence abounds that the presence of Great Britain in India has not always recommended the Christian church to the Indian mind. There is no question but that Great Britain has done much for India in giving her stable government, protection against the warlike tribes beyond the Khyber Pass, the development of transportation by which the ravaging famines have been well-nigh eliminated. There seems no doubt that these are blessings undisguised. But the Indian has come to see that the motive of Great Britain was the protection and facilitation of her commerce rather than as a help to India per se. And India looks upon Britain's patronizing airs with un-

concealed disdain. As a result, to the more thoughtful Indians the Christian church has had to reckon with the criticism of being a possible agent of imperialism. Here, as in China and Japan, there is deep resentment against what seems to them using religion as a means to establish allegiance to an alien culture and an alien race which makes superior pretensions. Another complication in India is the fact of the presence there of three oriental religions of considerable numbers. The Hindus, of course, predominate. But there are sufficient Mohammedans and Parsees in certain sections to swing the balance of power. The hard and fast lines of the caste system within Hinduism is a further complication. But in the face of all these complications the Greek petition, "Sirs, we would see Jesus," is rising all over India with increasing insistence.

In China, the leader of the new order, Sun Yat Sen, was an outspoken disciple of Jesus, but remained detached from the church because of its implications of allegiance to an alien state. Rome and Great Britain refused Chinese elevation to the rank of bishop, which meant an alien control of the church. "Missionaries with such ideas must go," said a Nationalist to me in Shanghai. "But," said he, "the missionaries who want to help us understand Jesus Christ and make him our guide are welcome, the more the merrier. Nine of the thirteen members of the Cabinet are Christian, and Mr. Wang the Secretary of State is well known for his Christian principles." Sun Yat Sen has taught young China to listen to Jesus, but they will do it through a native church. Ghandi, in India, whose word today receives a wider and more revered respect than any other man now living on our planet, constantly uses the name Jesus in describing conduct. He is a profound student of the New Testament as well as the Bhagavad Gita, the Uphanishads and the Vedas, but when he would set up a standard from which to judge human motives or religious aspirations he passes by the Hindu catalogue of the saints: Brahm, Siva and Vishnu, the Hindu trinity, do not serve his purpose. His appeal is to the pattern of Jesus Christ. Stanley Jones quotes a brilliant Hindu as saying: "What Christian missionaries have not been able to do in fifty years Ghandi, by his life and trial and incarceration has done,

namely, he has turned the eyes of India toward the Cross." But Ghandi refuses identification with the Christian church to protect himself and India from alien domination. A member of the Arya Somaj, a sort of red shirt organization hostile to Christianity, says: "You may forget your name, you may forget your mother, but do not forget that the missionaries are the enemies of your country and your civilization." But their leading magazine in describing Ghandi called him "the modern Christ," unconsciously approving the missionaries' message while declaiming himself against the missionary as agent. India is prepared to respond to Jesus. I should say that India in a most marvelous way is responding to Jesus.

The Indian legislature, considering her traditions, has made long strides towards abolishing some of her vicious customs and laws. The ageold custom of burning a widow who survived her husband on the same funeral pyre with him was abolished by law some decades since. Child marriage was forbidden by a law that went into effect at the beginning of this year. But why multiply cases? Rather ask whence came the inspiration for this radical legislation so fundamentally transforming of Hinduism. And to this there is but one answer: it has come from the Christ with whom they have become acquainted through the labors of the foreign missionary.

In the light of these facts what shall we conclude concerning the foreign missions enterprise? It seems but fair that we should marvel at its achievement. Within three quarters of a century Jesus has become preëminent in Japan; within three centuries China has been inspired to lay off a three thousand year political system, together with its religious philosophy, and undertake the most unparalleled social and political reconstruction of all time, illuminated by the conceptions of humanity and of social organization which they have found in the heart of the Christian West; India, with its mysticism, its caste, its fatalism, is awakened to a sense of individuality and has taken into her life the pattern and the ideals of Jesus. I have not said that these nations are Christian. I am not sure that I know of any nation that is. What I have said is that in

spite of the failures of the church in the West the missionaries have presented a Christ to the Orient whom the leading thinkers of these far eastern lands are accepting and they are building a new order among their own people in his pattern. The Greek petition, "Sirs, we would see Jesus," has permeated the spirit of the orient.

"Oh, East is East, and West is West,
And never the twain shall meet."
So spake a son of man—and erred!

Oh, man is man, and man with man shall meet,
So taught the Son of Man, and at His feet,
Bade us there learn the worth of human worth;
To see the man apart from race and birth.

To find in Aryan pale and Aryan brown,
In Mongol and in sun-black African,
The oneness of humanity—the same
God-touched, aspiring, worthful soul of man.

Boast not, oh Aryan pale, o'er Aryan brown,
Of greatness not in thee—'tis in the gift!
For, once, a nail-pierced Hand of Asia touched
Thy life and grants thee now his gracious lift.

Beware, lest in the roll of judging years,
That hand, withdrawn from thee through pride of race,
May touch to power those races now despised,
And grant to them thy forfeit—power and place.

The Master bids thee lose thy petty self
In service, and thy help to brothers give;
And thou shalt truly find thyself again,
Twill be thy gain, and others too shall live.

Thus freed from tribal mind and attitude,
Thy Christained soul, with self renounced, shall find
A larger, richer self of brotherhood;
Since, with the Christ, it has the Kingdom mind.

A Kingdom where there is no East nor West;
There are no walls dividing clan from clan;

But brotherhood is wide as humankind,
And with a King who is the Son of Man.

Oh, man is man, and man with man shall meet,
So speaks the Son of Man. Oh, Master! shamed,
But learning, sit we here—here at thy feet.

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS AND THE INNER LIFE OF MAN[1]

CHARLES M. JACOBS
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

WE are living in the most amazingly active generation that has ever been upon the earth. But this active generation is not without its serious interests. Humanity as a whole is not engaged in the mere search for new sensations, however it may be with a small and unduly conspicuous portion of it. The possibility of new sensations has come through the discovery of new natural laws. Our eyes are open upon a larger world than men have ever seen before. The "closed universe" is closed no longer. The limiting barriers have been broken through in a hundred places and through the gaps we have glimpsed vast depths of unsuspected possibility surrounding us on every side. Thus we are seeing life, all life, in new perspectives.

In these new perspectives we see life as a task. There is nothing new in that, for it is as a task that most men always have regarded life. The newness lies in the fact that the task we see is no longer small but vastly large, no longer simple but perplexingly complex. Life is full of things to do—great things that can be accomplished only through the doing of numberless little things; little things that are, or may be the means to great things. And life, in this view of it, is the doing of these things. But whether the things are great or little, whether they are confused and disconnected or organized into some systematic plan of action, they are things, things to do, objects of activity. And when we seek to interpret life, to get at the real meaning of it, it is these things to do that furnish us with our data. We start with them.

Thus, either consciously or unconsciously, most of us are

1 Read at the Interseminary Movement, Seventh Annual Conference of the Student Association of Middle Atlantic Seminaries, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., Feb. 27-Mar. 1, 1930.

pragmatists. In business and in politics we always have been pragmatists. We always have believed that the values of courses of action are to be tested by results, and that the best course is that which brings the best results. But our generation has carried its pragmatism to still greater lengths. We have become, or are becoming pragmatists in philosophy and in religion. We may not have formulated our pragmatism or become professed adherents of the philosophy of William James, but we have ceased to revere either the great philosophies or the great theologies of the past. We may admire them as creations of the human spirit; but what we really admire, in our secret hearts, is not the creations but the creators; not the philosophies and the theologies, but the sheer intellectual power that brought them into existence. So we admire the pyramids of Egypt and the temples of ancient Greece. They prove to us that the Egyptians and the Greeks were great peoples; but we are not building either pyramids or temples; we are not even interested in trying. We take off our hats to Plato and Hegel, but we have little use for Platonism or Hegelianism. The men were great dreamers, but the only value of their dreams is that they show us how great the dreamers were. We make our bows to them and go on to something really useful, like building airplanes and tunneling rivers and making new laws to govern people's habits.

And so it is with our theologies! The churches of today are little interested in theology, but greatly interested in programs. The impatience with denominationalism that is so prevalent both within and without our theological seminaries is rooted in the current pragmatism. It is felt that differences in conviction must not be allowed to interfere with programs. The program is the main thing. Unite on the program, and then support it with whatever theory is best adapted to the carrying of the load. The test of correctness in belief is its practicability, its adaptability to courses of action arrived at independently of theory. The plea of today is for a minimum of doctrine and a maximum of ethics. At the fartherest extreme of this pragmatic tendency, away out on the left wing, stands the behaviorist, beckoning us over into his

realm of conditioned reflexes, where we may find peace and joy in the knowledge that there is no such thing as mind, but that thought itself is action.

This is the kind of world to which we have to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Our preaching is bound to be influenced by that fact. We are ourselves a part of this restless generation, and its spirit has entered into us. Its energy permeates us, its estimate of values affects our moral judgments and helps to set the goals for which we strive.

It is inevitable that in such an age the Gospel of Jesus should take some distorted and perverted forms. Every student of Christian history knows what Hellenism did to the Gospel. What he is likely to forget is that the teachers of Gnosticism were fundamentally sincere in their belief that they were preaching a true Gospel, the only Gospel that was real and genuine, though it was not the Gospel of Jesus or of Paul. It was a Gospel adapted less to the thought-forms than to the estimates of worth provided by the age in which they lived. Gnosticism does not surprise the historian; he would more likely be surprised if he found that the Gospel had been untouched by Gnostic influence. Deism, in a later age, does not surprise him; it was a perversion of the Gospel that had to arise in an age that held the estimate of value which the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries possessed. So the historian of the future will some day look back upon our own time and speak of its pragmatic Gospel as a perversion that had to be, that was inevitable in an age that made so much of the outer, so little of the inner life of man.

The Jesus of history would not have been at home in the world that we know so well. Even the sluggish current of the life of Palestine was too swift for him to stay in it long at a time. The brief record of his doings in the Synoptic Gospels shows that very clearly. It is spotted with episodes of withdrawal, with solitary hours, with prayers on mountain-tops, and agonies in gardens. It is full of that which we call "communion with God," though for many of us the phrase has little real content. Even Paul—that restless, ardent, ever-active spirit—would feel himself an utter

stranger in the world we know. So, for that matter, would any of the men who have attained greatness in the proclamation of the Gospel.

But that is not all! As I think back upon these men the thing that impresses me most immediately is that they were strangers to their own world. The better they knew it, the less at home they were within it. It was the environment of their outward lives. It was the sphere in which they acted. It gave them their immediate objectives. It set their tasks. But always they felt themselves apart from it, rather than a part of it. They had standards of value which it did not know, motives of action which it did not share, ultimate aims which lay beyond its power to see. They had a life that was not the world's life. They moved the world because they had achieved detachment from it and therefore saw it in a light in which it could not see itself. That has been the way of all the prophets, of all the great preachers of the Gospel. They have spoken to men of absolute values, spurning the relative values of the pragmatist and the worldly-wise maxims of the moralist, and going to the hearts of men with the declaration, "Thus saith the Lord; this is the will of God."

There is a phrase in the opening paragraph of the First Epistle of Clement that mirrors naively, and all the more faithfully because it is naive, the sense of detachment from the world that the early Christians had. "The church of God sojourning in Rome to the church of God sojourning in Corinth." Rome! Corinth! These are environments. These are the outer envelopes in which the life of the church is lived. But within the envelopes the life goes forward, the inner life, the real life. And when I read that phrase I cannot help remembering that it was to this Roman church that Paul had written forty years before, "And be not conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your minds that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

A few months ago I was present in a meeting of professors of theology. Among them were many men of distinction. Practically every school of Protestant thought was represented there,

from the most conservative to the most liberal. The subject of discussion was the Christian Apologetic for Today, and the trend of the discussion was throughout pragmatic—Christianity is justified by the results that it produces. When at last one member of the group arose to say a word in behalf of the internal evidence for the truth of Christianity, for what the old theologians used to call the "inner testimony of the Holy Spirit," his remarks were received with something like impatience, and when he referred to the mystics as men from whom we might learn something about the nature of religion, the impatience was voiced in one man's comment, that the mystics were men who sat still and did nothing.

In the face of that attitude, which I know to be a very prevalent one today, and just because it is so prevalent, I venture the assertion that the inner life of man is the only life with which the Gospel of Jesus has anything directly to do. It has effects upon man's outer life; it does call forth effort,and give direction to man's strivings; but it does all of those things by indirection. The Gospel, laying hold of man's inner life, generates motive and produces results of the first importance in man's outer life. But these external things are effects not causes. Either they spring from the inner life, touched and vivified by the Gospel, or they are not in any high and true sense Christian.

That seems to me to be the plain sense of Christ's own teaching and the obvious conclusion from his own life. He was seeking all the time to get through the hard shell of conventional religion and reach directly into the innermost recesses of men's true selves. He was utterly unconcerned with programs and policies and organized activities of any kind. He had no regard for the distinction between the degrees of goodness and badness which were recognized by his own generation. He turned away from Scribes and Pharisees and companied with publicans and sinners. He declared that the religious pragmatists of his time had prepared for the society which they controlled a fate less tolerable than that of Sodom and Gomorrah.

He visited the religious leaders of his day with blistering denunciation and held them up to contempt. His accusations against

the scribes was not that they were bad theologians, and his charge against the Pharisees was not that they did not keep the law. They were "whited sepulchres, inwardly full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness." They thought that correct theology and correct conduct were righteousness. "Except your righteousness shall exceed theirs, ye shall not enter the kingdom," was his proclamation to the multitude, which held them in esteem. He was reiterating the confession of the Psalm writer, "Behold Thou desirest truth in the inward parts and in the hidden part Thou shalt make me to know wisdom."

It is customary nowadays to find in the Sermon on the Mount a program of social progress. I believe that it does contain a social ideal. I am quite sure that no Christian ought to be satisfied, and no thoroughly sincere and earnest Christian will be satisfied, with any social condition less perfect than the ideal society that is depicted there and in the parables of the kingdom. I am equally sure that we go far away from the meaning of Jesus when we think that this ideal society can be created otherwise than through a progressive development of the inner life of man. The kingdom of God must be within us. No man can be in the kingdom unless the kingdom is in him.

The really characteristic thing in the Sermon on the Mount is not its teaching about society or about conduct, but its teaching about God. It represents the effort of the Supreme Teacher to lead men into a life of trust, in which they will find the prophecy fulfilled in the depest depths of their own natures, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee."

The Gospel of Jesus brings us face to face with these inner selves of ours. Until it has done that for us, we are not yet Christians. We read the Beatitudes, and what we discover there is not the portrait of any man that we have ever known, or of any man who has ever lived, except Jesus himself. Such a portrait would have to be a picture of activities conditioned by time and place and opportunity, the hundred and one variables that make the differences among men. What we do find there is the picture of an inner self; and that is timeless. It may exist in any century in

any land; in Jesus' own Palestine, in the Italy of St. Francis, in the France of St. Bernard, in our own Chicago or New York. And yet we know that in us that inner self does not exist as Jesus pictured it, that self which turns the other cheek, and goes the second mile and sends the cloak after the stolen coat. It is not that we do not do these things. We might do all of them and yet be merely whited sepulchres for dead men's bones. That is not the trouble. The trouble is that we are not the kind of people who would do these things instinctively. Our left hands must know what our right hands are doing; if our left hands did not know about it, our right hands would not be doing it.

The Gospel of Jesus brings us a picture of an inner life, of that self which a man may be, and in so doing it forces us to self-examination. It is not the kind of self-examination that the Roman church demands in the confessional. It is little concerned with what we did today or yesterday, or even with what we thought. It is the kind of self-examination that faces us with the "inner man," the man that loves and hates and lusts and hopes and fears, the man that is the real self behind our conduct. That brings us small comfort. Indeed it brings us most acute discomfort. The contrast between the standard and the reality is far too great, and the standard is unattainable, if an angry word breaks one commandment and a lustful thought another.

But even that is not the chief thing! The Gospel of Jesus brings us face to face with God. If you ask me how it does that, I shall freely confess that I do not know. I cannot reason it out in any way that altogether satisfies the demand of my mind for a purely rational explanation of facts. None the less, I know that we do find God there and that we do recognize his presence.

That is the basic fact with which theology begins. For that reason it is also the fact to which theology always returns. Theology seeks to rationalize the fact and discover its content; to picture it accurately and draw conclusions from it; to analyze it and account for it. But it is important for us to remember that the fact, this inescapable conviction that the Gospel brings us face to face with God, is antecedent to reflection upon it; that it persists

through all our theologizing; and that it exists in multitudes of men and women who are quite incapable of forming any theories about it.

Of course there is an abundance of such theoreis. We may speak, with the idealists, about an intellectual intuition which reveals ultimate truth; or we may speak with Schleiermacher about "the absolute feeling of dependence" leading us to a recognition of the absolute; or we may speak with Otto and his school, about a "numinous perception" and a sense of "shuddering mystery"; or we may speak with Prof. Baillie, following the lead of the Kantians, about a rational insight of a moral kind which causes us to see God. All of these theories are open to criticism, and all of them contain some matter of truth. But that truth is, after all, only the basic fact from which theology starts. We do find God in the Gospel, and then, in our poor fumbling human way, we try to trace out the path by which we came to him or he to us. It may be questioned whether any of these modern theories gets us beyond old Tertullian's *Anima naturaliter Christiana,* or Augustin's *Tu nos fecisti ad te.*

The point that I really want to make is that the purpose of the Gospel of Jesus is to produce this consciousness of God, and the only place where it can be produced is the inner life of man. The Gospel is a call to a life of trust. That call runs through it all. You hear it in the Sermon on the Mount, in the parables of the kingdom, in the great discourses of the Fourth Gospel, in the teaching and preaching of Paul. And there is that within us—call it by what name you can—which responds to that call. Deep calls to deep and gets its answer; spiritual nature calls to spiritual nature and the reply comes back. That essential self of which I was speaking a moment ago, knows that it is in God's presence.

No man's discovery of self is complete until he has thus discovered God and no man ever sees himself as he is until he has thus seen God. That is why we must think of the knowledge of self and of other selves which the Gospel of Jesus brings us as a revelation. It is the consciousness of God which the Gospel produces that gives this other knowledge its peculiar color and poig-

nancy. We recognize this other knowledge to be subsidiary and secondary and the consciousness of God to be the great experience of life.

It is no part of my present purpose to attempt a theology that will give adequate expression to this knowledge, but I do want to suggest that the three great ideas of the New Testament derive their meaning from it. These ideas are sin and righteousness and grace. Sin is not mere moral delinquency or imperfection. It is not merely transgression of limits or violation of commandments or the missing of a mark. It is all of these; but it is more than all of these. Sin is unworthiness to be in the presence of God. Righteousness is not merely right-doing, the keeping of commandments, the subordination of self to a higher or a larger good. It is all of these; but is more. It is an inner spiritual resemblance to God which makes us worthy to be in his presence. Both words contain the notion of relationship, and neither can be really understood without the revelation of God to the inner self. So grace is God's love in contact with our unworthiness, not merely in contrast with it. Apart from sin the very term is meaningless.

What some of us think to be the greatest weakness of contemporary Christianity is its failure to take a firm grip on these fundamental ideas, which have their home in the inner life of man. We are so anxious to find God in the earthquake and the storm-wind and the lightning, that we do not hear the still, small voice. We are so eager to find God in the movements of society, in human welfare and social progress, that we miss him in our inner lives. If we miss him there, we miss him everywhere. We may find that which we call God, or we may give the name of God to what we find outside of us—an ultimate energy, a personalized ideal of social well-being, "a principle of concretion"; but none of these is "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Him we find when the Gospel of Jesus speaks to the inner self, the self that loves and hates and hopes and fears and trusts. When we once have found him there, then we can find him everywhere, and self and other selves and nature all show his presence to us.

This kind of revelation of God and self comes only through

the Gospel of Jesus. It is not the same thing that the mystic receives, when he retreats into the recesses of his own spirit and sinks himself, in feeling and imagination, into the World-all. It has a definiteness that the mystical experience does not possess; it comes to us through a Person, a man who has lived on earth, and whom his own revelation has caused us to acknowledge as Son of God. We may recognize truth in what others than Jesus have taught. We may even think of this truth as revelation—indeed I believe that we cannot think of it in any other way. But our attitude toward this other revelation can never be the same as toward the revelation which the Gospel brings. Our treatment of these other revelations must always be selective, and our principle of selection is given us by Christ. His revelation is not only supreme, but unique, and our estimate of him must always differ in kind, as well as in degree, from our estimate of other teachers.

The inner life of the man to whom the revelation of the Gospel has come is not a weak thing. It is no sensitive-plant that withers at a touch. It does not shrink from the rude contacts of the life of action. The Gospel enters this outer life in two forms—as ideal and as motive. We need not involve ourselves in the old arguments about final and efficient causes in order to realize that life needs both. The Gospel sets us as a goal to aim at, a whole world of transformed inner lives; it drives us to the task of making this new world with the conviction that this is the will of a loving God; "God's goal as well as our own, our goal because God's." Because I bleieve this, I am sure that the prayer which we most need to say continually for one another is the same that Paul offered for his Ephesian Christians: "That ye may be strengthened with all might in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith, that ye, being rooted and grounded in love may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height, and to know the love of God that passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God."

THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE TO THE CHURCH

JOHN C. MATTES
Scranton, Pennsylvania

ON February 18, 1569, Philip II of Spain wrote to the Duke of Alva, who was then in Brussels, "I have learned that either among certain papers belonging to my Lord the Emperor, who is now in glory, or else in the archives of that city, is the copy of the Augsburg Confession, which Philip Melanchthon wrote with his own hand. Because of the damned people who are in those countries it seems wise to remove it from this place, in view of the inclination they have towards this cursed sect, lest they regard it as a Koran. So it will be wise for you to tell Virgilius that you want to see this book and have him bring it and deliver it to you. You should retain it in your possession so that you can take it with you when, at a favorable opportunity, you are able to return to this kingdom. You should also take care that they give you the original and not a copy, in order that no part nor trace remains, that a work so pernicious may forever be destroyed."[1]

The pages of that copy, written in Melanchthon's bad handwriting, have long since disappeared. The fanatical Spanish king probably had the satisfaction of burning it, just as his country burned so many who confessed the faith that was there recorded; but neither the gloomy hatred of the king nor the gory cruelties of the Duke of Alva could suppress the faith itself. It is vain to fight against God. The Confession is still a living thing, and the army of its adherents has belted the entire world. For nigh to four centuries it has gained in the number of its followers and withstood all attempts to destroy it by those "who fain by craft or sword would wrest the kingdom from God's Son," because the same providence of God that brought it into being has also guided

1 Th. Kolde, "Neue Augustanastudien," *N. K. Zt.*, 17, 744.

its course during the centuries that have followed. It is hard to fight against God.

The providence of God has indeed been singularly evident in those two central creeds of the Reformation of which one has just passed, and the other is just approaching, its quadricentennial. In the Small Catechism the church's experience of God's grace has been given to the individual for the guidance of his soul. I say that advisedly; for no matter how largely it was an immediate result of the personal life adventure into spiritual things of a Saxon monk, that experience and that result would not have been the same if it had not been for the experience of all Christendom, which he shared. It was so manifestly a book of the church for the individual that by acclamation, as it were, it became a confession.

In the Augustana, on the other hand, we have a professed confession of the church, which however, as we shall presently see, came to be such only through the providence of God, and contrary to the original intentions of the authors. At first only intended to be the confession of certain individuals, it grew into a common confession of the Communion of Saints, in which they, as a unity, professed the truth before the world, refuted error, and bound themselves together in the one true faith.

In neither case were they any longer private documents after their acceptance and presentation by the church. Neither Melanchthon nor Luther had any right to change their final form as confessions—just as St. Peter could not have changed the teaching of his epistles nor St. John the gospel that bears his name, after the Spirit of God had guided them to their final results and had brought about that which was to be a permanent standard for the church. We all know how Philip Melanchthon failed to appreciate this fact in later years and still dreamed of this great document as something that belonged to him and could be altered and verbally improved at his will. Others saw more clearly. When a rumor came to the Elector John Frederick that something of the sort had been undertaken, though in this case the rumor was mistaken, he wrote to Luther and Melanchthon, "It was reported that Philip

has presumed to alter and soften in some points and to print in another form the Confession presented by His Electoral Grace and other princes and jurisdictions (Stände) to His Imperial Majesty at Augsburg."[2]

The same peculiar immunity applies to our own day. Only the church can deal with this document, and no individual has any right to add to or subtract from the fundamental declarations concerning the doctrines therein expressed. Those who belong to the church, who bear her name, who are accounted her teachers and members must be guided by her common confession or withdraw from her ranks. There are no dead articles in the Confession. Those who confess the faith of the church must confess and accept all or none. Any one who attempts to make his reservations to suit his own convenience and still poses as one of the adherents of the Augsburg Confession is either not honest with himself or not honest with others. If he does not agree with its teaching or regards it as unscriptural, he has a perfect right to do so but he never has the right at the same time to call himself a Lutheran. It is time that we stop floundering around in the soggy bogs of slippery sentiment and walk on the solid ground of common honesty.

We are commemorating the great central creed of modern times. I take it for granted that all are familiar with its history and contents and so would only point out a few facts which distinguish it from other pronouncements and help us to uderstand its significance as a work of God and as a document through which he has given us such a clear and splendid confession of his Word in the midst of the many and manifold errors of these our latter days. To grasp the significance of the Confession we must recall some of the facts which disclose the providential origin of the Augustana.

I ITS PROVIDENTIAL ORIGIN

Like the Reformation itself, the Confession, as such, was an unpremeditated work. Luther had not set out to be a reformer.

2 Th. Kolde, *Historische Einleitung in die symbolischen Bücher, etc.*, p. XXIII.

God forced him to the task. Originally there was no intention of presenting a confession of faith at Augusburg or of framing a creed. It was God who again forced the issue.

As the Emperor drew near and the time set for the Diet drew closer, some answer had to be given concerning the religious differences that had arisen in the German lands of the Holy Roman Empire, where for so many centuries church and state had been so closely entwined. What affected the church affected the state.

As a result of the effort to heal the breach between Luther and the Swiss the rather unsatisfactory Marburg Articles had come into being. When, shortly before, the Elector had wanted a statement of the evangelical faith for his own use, the Schwabach Articles had been prepared.[3] These two combined were to form the basis for the later confession. Now, as the Emperor wanted to heal the religious divisions, some account of the abuses objected to was necessary; so the Torgau Articles supplied a catalogue and furnished the basis for the second half of the Confession. Without going into the well-known details of these preliminaries, it is important to remember that the evangelical princes and theologians went to Augsburg without a ready-made confession. Probably only the abuses would have been considered if Eck had not issued his four hundred and four Theses in which he accused the Protestants of all possible and impossible heresies. So instead of being a mere bill of complaints or list of abuses it became a confession of faith. Just as in the writing of the Scriptures God used human events to realize his purposes, so God guided the events of this later day.

As we look a little more closely at the events of the few weeks in Augsburg that preceded the presentation of the Confession, we are still more impressed with the way God guided its destinies.

Even after this "apology" had been shaped into a confession it was only meant to be one in the narrowest sense, as it was to be presented not for the church but only for the Elector of Saxony. Others wanted to unite with him. The City of Nürnberg, the

3 A full discussion of the relation of the Schwabach and Marburg Articles to each other, their priority, etc., will be found in Hans von Schubert, *Bekenntnisbildung und Religionspolitik.*

Margrave of Brandenburg and the Landgrave of Hesse, in particular, wanted to be included; but the old Elector of Saxony was obdurate. He did not want to be entangled; he only wanted to prove his own loyalty to the crown. The original draft of the Confession as it was sent home by the delegates from Nürnberg begins the first article with the words: "In the electoral principality of Saxony it is unanimously taught and preached that we must hold and believe the decree of the Council of Nicaea concerning the unity of the divine essence and the three persons."[4] When that was changed to "The churches with common consent among us, do teach that the decree of the Nicene Synod concerning the unity of the divine essence and the three persons is true, and without doubt to be believed," a territorial apology had vanished and a confession of the church had taken its place. It was only ten days before its final presentation that the Elector finally yielded. A higher power than the Elector's politics was shaping the ends of destiny. He did what he had not intended to do and, as a result, there was handed to the Emperor a common confession which he did not want, and all because God's wisdom had brought it to pass.

With this change came another. Melanchthon's elaborate preface to the earlier document, to which the Wittenberg professor attached so much importance, with all its fulsome adulation of the Emperor, was thrown into the discard, and the sturdy, straightforward declaration of Chancellor Brück took its place. The whole attitude was changed. With the appeal to a general council in the background it became a document of the church, not the state, and with it, in the end, came the realization that the church must settle its own problems without the powers of this world; that these two powers were not to be confused nor intermingled. Yes, with its declaration that this is the teaching of the Church Catholic, it becomes a church declaration *ex professo*.

We can still further trace the hand of God in making this a real confession of the faith that had been so long obscured and was now in such danger of being lost. Philip of Hesse is admitted among the group of subscribers, and perhaps some of the original

4 Th. Kolde, *Die älteste Redaktion der Augsburger Konfession*, p. 11.

sharp statements concerning the Sacramentarians were softened for his sake; but his preferences did not change the doctrine that was confessed in Article X. It still remained a clear confession of the Real Presence. It might be stretched to cover transubstantiation, but it could never include a Zwinglian or Calvinistic teaching concerning the Blessed Sacrament. God was guarding the truth of his Word in spite of all political alliances.

Not only was this article satisfactory to the Roman theologians at first, but over thirty years later the Naumburger Fürstentag shattered largely on this article, which makes impossible either a Zwinglian or a Calvinistic statement of the Presence. The Zurich theologians in an opinion of August 2, 1560 rejected it as "papal" and as teaching transubstantiation,[5] and in the course of the deliberations of the Naumburg gathering the Elector of the Palatinate urged the use of the Latin version alone, as the German words "unter Gestalt des Brodes und Weines" would in his opinion admit the teaching of transubstantiation.[6] The Hessian theologians were of the same opinion.[7] It was clearly understood in those discussions, and this was the real basis of the objection, that the Tenth Article absolutely excluded not only the Zwinglian but also the Calvinistic interpretation of this doctrine, and the accounts of the Naumburger Fürstentag show very clearly the dishonesty of those who tried to smuggle in the falsely-spiritual interpretation of Calvinism under the Aegis of the Augustana.[8] While, of course, the church has elsewhere rejected transubstantiation, we must not forget that to the fathers as well as to every clear thinking theologian who grasps the Lutheran doctrine, such an error concerning the mode of the presence is far less dangerous than that error which is not satisfied with rejecting transubstantiation but also rejects the actual Presence (the *manducatio oralis*). This one particular Roman error, in the last analysis, is not as dangerous nor as destructive as the error of Calvinism. How clearly Luther saw the danger and how intensely he felt on the subject is

5 Calinich, *Der Naumburger Fürstentag*, p. 73.
6 *Ibid.*, pp. 191 f.; 160.
7 *Ibid.*, p. 317.
8 Cf. Calinich, *op. cit.*, 245 f.; 254-255.

shown by the familiar words of his *Confession of the Lord's Supper* (1528): "Before I would believe, like the fanatics, that there is only wine present, I would rather hold, with the pope, that there was only blood."[9]

In still another way we can trace a providential guidance. The secret diplomacy of Melanchthon during those days is all too well known.[10] He was ready to compromise, to meet half way, to hold all sorts of dubious conferences with the adversaries. In his own timid soul he thought more of peace and safety than of speaking God's testimonies before kings and not being ashamed. The marvel of it all is that he could do so little mischief in spite of his exalted reputation, and that laymen and theologians of lesser gifts could keep him so well in line and that in spite of himself he was compelled to do what he wished to avoid.

The Elector, the Landgrave of Hesse, and Philip Melanchthon were all led into ways in which they had not chosen to walk, because the Spirit of God was guiding the church. As we study the result of these negotiations we will more and more realize how completely the resulting Confession had become a document of the church. We see that very clearly reflected in

II ITS CATHOLIC CHARACTER

We do not refer to the supposed "moderation" of the Confession, which lies in language rather than in fundamentals, because there is certainly no lack of emphatic rejection of Roman errors, but to the clear consciousness that this is the teaching of an older and purer age; that it is a return, not an innovation; that it is the true development of the doctrine of the fathers to meet the errors of the day; that it implies no separation from the Church Catholic but is the reaffirmation of the true apostolic teaching of that universal church. There is a horror of separation and a clear rejection of Erastianism into which men like Melanchthon might easily have plunged the church. The final appeal is not to the Emperor but to a general council.

9 W. A., 26, 242.

10 See, for example, Kawerau, *Die Versuche Melanchthon zur katolischen Kirche zurückzuführen,* pp. 8 f.

No new church was ever begun by Luther or those who happen to bear the name Lutheran because they teach the pure Gospel. We have the solemn protestations of the Confession itself to that effect. The Confession is presented that "Hereafter the one unfeigned and true religion may be embraced and preserved by us, so that as we are subjects and soldiers of the one Christian Church, so also, in unity and concord, we may live in the one Christian Church" (33:4). The Confession that hopes to promote that unity offers nothing new: "Those things also have been enumerated, which it seemed necessary to say, that it might be understood, that in doctrine and ceremonials amongst us there is nothing received contrary to Scripture or to the Catholic Church, inasmuch as it is manifest that we have diligently taken heed that no new and godless doctrines should creep into our Churches" (67:5). So the Confession begins and ends, and within it there are similar statements. The doctrinal part closes with the claim that it "can be seen that there is nothing which is discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Church Catholic, or even with the Roman Church, so far as that church is known from the writings of the fathers." The second part opens with the statement, "Inasmuch as the Churches among us dissent in no article of faith from the Church Catholic, and only omit a few of certain abuses" (47:1, 1).

Neither are they afraid to draw the conclusion that follows from this claim. If the Romanists refuse to accept the pure teaching they will be guilty of disrupting the unity of the church. But who shall judge as to the responsibility for a schism? Is not the supreme authority of the church as then constituted in Rome? That point was not yet admitted even by those who were thoroughly committed to the other doctrinal corruptions. It is a curious fact that the papal legates who appeared at Naumburg requesting the princes to send delegates to the reconvened Council of Trent also asked them to explain why they had separated themselves from the Roman church.[11] Not till 1870 was that claim finally affirmed; but the supreme authority was still regarded by most theologians as something that resided in the church itself as

11 Calinich, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

assembled in a general council. To such a council the appeal was made, but tacitly a greater authority was here recognized than even a council, an authority without which the Church Catholic could not exist—the authority of the Gospel. Herein lies the significance of the concluding words of Article XXVIII, "Now our meaning is not to have rule taken from the bishops: but this one thing only is requested at their hands, that they would relax a few observances, which cannot be held without sin. But if they will remit none, let them look how they will give account to God for this, that by their obstinacy they afford cause of schism."

Nine years later Luther makes the application very pointedly when he says of the papists, "And herewith they testify and proclaim out of their own mouths that they aim to be the true Antichrists and Autokatakrites, who condemn themselves and obstinately want to be condemned. Herewith they exclude themselves from the church and publicly proclaim that they are and will remain the worst foes of the churches."[12]

This consciousness of being the true heir to the Catholic and Apostolic church was universal among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. In the ordination certificates of those who were ordained at Wittenberg, as well as in forms used elsewhere, there were statements to the effect that the candidate had been obligated to "hold completely and rightly that pure doctrine of the Gospel which the Catholic Church of Christ confesses and which we teach in our Church, and to shun all impious and fanatical opinions, rejected by the judgments of the Catholic Church of Christ and opposed to that doctrine which is maintained by our Church. He promises moreover diligence and faithfulness in his ministry, and promises that this same doctrine of the Catholic Church of Christ, which we profess, will be purely transmitted and defended by him."[13]

Later on, the claim becomes still more explicit. In the German ordination examination of Melanchthon, 1552, it is stated thus: "So the first and most important thing is that the teaching

12 "Von der conciliis und kirchen," 1539. W. A., 50, 512.

13 Enders, *Luthers Briefwechsel*, 11, 278-9. Sixteen similar examples will be found in this work alone, issued between the years 1537 and 1544.

of Christianity, in which God has revealed His nature and will, be planted and kept pure and complete, as it is contained in the writings of the apostles and prophets and in the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds, with which the catechism and confession of Luther and the Confession which was delivered to the Emperor at Augsburg in the year 1530 agree."[14]

When Selneccer, in 1579, issued a new edition of George of Anhalt's treatise concerning ordination, he said in the *Epistola Dedicatoria,* "We are members and citizens of the Church Catholic, that is of the universal Church of all the Christians dispersed through the world and united to one God and Mediator Christ, by one Word, one faith, one Baptism, one Lord's Supper, etc. We are not members of the papal church, which in very truth we are neither able to call Catholic nor Roman when the faith of the Roman Church as it is expressed in the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans is persecuted by the papists, and is hated worse than the old serpent, and condemned, and for a long time it has fallen away from the Catholic and Roman Church, and therefore as it is Antichristian is also Anticatholic or Befouled (Cacolyea) and Anti-Roman, that is the synagogue of Satan, and remains so by its own regular succession."[15]

It was not till the beginning of the seventeenth century that the unfortunate and untrue desigation of Romanists as "Catholics" began to appear in the writings of the theologians. Even the laymen fully understood the difference between Roman and Catholic—even laymen who were not Protestants. On September 6, 1564, for example, Maximilian II issued an order to the University of Vienna which directed "that in the future those who are to be given degrees by the University, if they have confessed that they are Catholic and desire to be included in the communion of the Holy Catholic Mother-Church, are not to be compelled further to confess the faith of the Roman Church."[16]

Aside from its explicit profession and direct statements, the

14 *CR.* XXIII, p. XXXIII f. Drews, *Die Ordination, etc.,* p. 31.

15 Selneccer's not very elegant pun can best be seen in the original: "idioque ut Antichristiana, ita et Anticatholica, seu Cacolyea et Anti Romana."

16 Seile, *Schicksalsbuch der ev. Kirche in Oesterreich,* p. 25.

catholic character of the Augsburg Confession shows itself in two ways. There is a profound regard for the pure teaching of the past and a perfect respect for all the great doctrinal statements of the preceding ages which could be tested and approved by the Word of God. There is no *de novo* construction of theology, only a return to an older and purer tradition. Take the first few articles for example, and you will find them the logical development of the Ecumenical Creeds, but with the errors of later periods eliminated. Right in the Second Article, on Original Sin, we find a return to an older and purer teaching than the one that prevailed among the scholastics and in Rome. It is more in harmony with the presuppositions of the Nicene Creed, more scriptural, and therefore more Catholic.

At first sight such a statement might seem far-fetched; but it is a logical deduction from the words of the Creed, "Who, for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven, etc." This is a statement that is not restricted to the elect only but applies to the whole race, including the new babes. It implies an inherent, inborn, inherited evil that is so truly sin and so completely condemns in God's sight that it required the incarnation, sufferings, death and resurrection of God's Son to remove its guilt. It means a positive evil and something more than the weak and largely negative conception of Rome.

The other evidence of its Catholic character is the attitude assumed towards externals. Here there is a true conservatism that decries disorder and individual willfulness, that strives truly to conserve the rich heritage of the past, and that values the Christian experience of the centuries. It was not a mere difference of temperament between Luther and Zwingli or Calvin that occasioned such a difference in their attitude towards what was beautiful and edifying and valuable in the heritage of the past, but a fundamental difference in their whole attitude towards the church and the Gospel.

To the southern reformers there remained a feeling of a quasi political character connected with the church. It was the old Roman idea in a new dress. In that church the Gospel remained

a species of law, a law that was to be enforced by drastic means, by rules and disciplines, whether canonical or presbyterial. To Luther and his associates the church was a visible-invisible Communion of Saints that was guided by the Holy Ghost, and that by its very nature could not perish. When the southern reformers rediscovered the pure Gospel they had to apply their legalistic ideas to it, and it once more became a law, though a law differently conceived and organized from that under the Roman obedience. So the church had to be made over according to this law, and all that had been gained by the experience of the preceding centuries, because there was so much error in those centuries and so much that was not especially enjoined in the New Testament, had to be discarded. They tried to leap back over the centuries to a primitive Christianity and reconstruct the whole picture in the sixteenth century, just as well meaning dreamers have tried to do in the twentieth.

But the idea of a Catholic church implies a continuous existence of a living organism, a universality not only in space but in time. And this was the conception of Luther. The church was a living organism, which might have corruption that was to be purged out, but which had also learned and profited by the guidance of the Holy Ghost through the centuries. It had always contained the living seed of God's Word, and from the earthly vessels by which that seed was sown and nurtured only that was to be removed which would interfere with its growth. In contrast to the legalistic, particularistic, predestinarian idea of the Reformed, the Augsburg Confession presents the idea of a living continuity, of a true growth and development of the church under God's guidance, even when human perversity and weakness had digressed from the right road and had produced excresences and abnormalities that had to be removed.

Human traditions are to be kept so long as they are profitable and do not burden consciences with the idea of merits gained by outward observances (Art. XV). Even such minor things as saints' days are not to be ruthlessly abolished but are to be used for a good purpose (Art. XXI). Above all, the public services of

the church are not to be stripped of their beauty. Because the Holy Sacrament is a reality and a real presence of the literal Body and Blood of the Lord, it must be observed with reverence and must be offered often to those who love the Lord and his appearing. Article XXIV, because of its practical bearing, deserves to be read oftener and pondered more carefully than is usually the case. "Our Churches are wrongfully accused of having abolished the Mass; for the Mass is retained on our part, and celebrated with the highest reverence. All the usual ceremonies are also preserved, save that the parts sung in Latin are interspersed here and there with German hymns, which have been added to teach the people." That means historically and in fact, the usual churchly appointments; the Altar, Crucifix and candles, the form of service, the festivals of the year and their altar song, yes, even the traditional vestments worn by the minister.

Both the facts and Luther's preference are clearly stated in an opinion concerning the Landgrave of Hesse written by Luther in 1541 and addressed to Chancellor Brück. In the course of his lettter he says: "Thank God in our churches those things that are indifferent in themselves are so conducted that a Wahl or Spaniard, who did not understand our language, when he sees our Mass, choir, organs, bells, chasubles, etc., would say that he was in a papal church and that there was no difference or only a very slight one."[17] Luther was no ritualist bound by outward observance, and he could be very free in his views and in the liberty he insisted on. Those statements are frequently quoted. But the other side is too often forgotten. He loved the old forms when they did not conceal error; he strove to preserve them; he wanted to maintain outward uniformity whenever possible.[18] Those who were closest to him shared the same views. In connection with the visitation of the Amt Allstedt, 1533, where the influence of Münster had been considerable, the service was ordered again to be said with "lighted

17 Enders, *Briefwechsel*, 13, 289.

18 Cf. for example, the letter to a pastor in Kiel, 1528; to a pastor in Göttingen, 1531; the statements in "Von den Conciliis und Kirchen," 1539, (W. A., 50, 619); and in "Von Misbrauch der Messen," 1521, (W. A., 8, 511).

candles," and the clergy were forbidden to appear in "ungeschickten Kleidern."[19]

No one who knows anything of the history of the church Orders of the time of the Reformation imagines that the anarchistic confusion of our own day was tolerated or regarded as an evidence of Christian liberty by the reformers. They did not confuse liberty with license any more than they regarded wholesome regulations as burdensome laws. It was long after, in the time of the Illumination, that the practice came into vogue of every pastor being a law unto himself and every congregation following its own whims. Then men began to reconstruct the liturgies according to their individual fancies.[20]

And note too that the Blessed Sacrament was not such a rare, mechanical, calendar regulated, quarterly episode in the life of the church as some afterwards tried to make it; but "seeing that the Mass is such a communion of the Sacrament, we do observe one common Mass every holy day, and on other days, if any will use the Sacrament, at which times it is offered to them which desire it." That it should be frequently desired was mentioned just before: "Therefore the Mass should be used to this end, that there the Sacrament may be reached unto them that have need of comfort; as Ambrose saith, 'Because I do always sin, therefore I ought always to receive the medicine.'" Apparently most people today do not sin as badly as this great father of the church, nor even as badly as Dr. Martin Luther, who communed every other Sunday, on the average. At least they do not seem to feel the need of this medicine for sin, and even some of the clergy apparently fail utterly to grasp its significance. We still have parishes where the infrequency of Communion would class them as almost heathen according to Luther's estimate as he states it in the preface to the Small Catechism.

19 For the questions of the visitation see C. A. H. Burkhardt, *Geschichte der sächsischen Kirchen- und Schulvisitationen von 1524 bis 1545.* Cf. also the thirtieth question of the series of fifty-eight Questions submitted to Luther just seven days before his death by George of Anhalt (Enders, *op. cit.*, Vol. 17, p. 40). Space forbids citing these and further examples, which might be multiplied at great length.

20 Cf. Paul Drews, *Der evangelische Geistliche*, p. 128.

Of course what was unscriptural was changed; a return to the true Catholic teaching made that necessary. "Both kinds of the Sacrament in the Lord's Supper are given to the laity, because that this custom hath the commandment of the Lord, 'Drink ye all of this': Matt. 26:27." It is the only passage of Holy Scripture that deals with the question. Turn to your Greek New Testament and you will find that the same command, the same words, directed the use of a common cup. If they did not, then neither is there any command to administer the Sacrament under both kinds.

III THE EVANGELICAL SPIRIT OF THE CONFESSION

It will not be necessary to dwell long on this theme, for its very history, the reason for its composition, the manner of its presentation, its avowed purpose and all its declarations tell in unmistakable language that here the one true Gospel is again confessed to men without the obscuring additions of human opinion and human work righteousness. In every article its words affirm and reaffirm the saving Gospel of God's grace. Two articles are especially outstanding in their presentation of the evangelical verities: Art. IV, "Of Justification" and Art. XX, "Of Good Works."

Just as men who have struggled in great danger and uncertainty against fires raging underground, who have almost smothered in the heat and foul gases of a mine, made all the worse by the surrounding darkness and impending danger, draw a full breath and walk with quickened steps as the pure cool air fills their lungs and the blessed light of the sun lightens their path, so these great declarations came like a breath of lifegiving air, and their truths were like a clear and shining light to those who had been walking in the darkness of superstition and toiling to escape the fires of hell by their own labors. So they are even now; for the greatest peril to men's souls is still the idea that they can save themselves, the greatest need of the church is still to understand and preach the great central truth that no man is ever justified in any way whatsoever before God by his own words, but only by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, which is given to those who believe.

IV ITS MESSAGE FOR THE PRESENT

As both the church and the individual soul only live as they grasp the living reality of that righteousness that comes through faith, so there is need of extending that same consciousness of reality to the means by which faith and righteousness are given through the church to the individual. Every part of our preaching and ministration has to do with realities; not with empty signs or appeals to man's reason, but with the actual impartation of grace. That is one of the great messages of the Augustana to the present century. When we turn to Articles IX, X, XI, XVIII and XXV we are told in unmistakable terms of the reality of regeneration through Baptism and of the actual working of the Holy Ghost through that Sacrament; we have the clear-cut affirmation that the actual body that hung on the Cross and the Blood that was there shed are really imparted to all who partake of the Blessed Sacrament; we learn that Confession and Absolution is a wholesome thing because it is a divine institution and its forgiveness a reality. But on our part there must be a real spiritual reception to gain their blessings; a real faith must appropriate what is really there. Oh, the church needs to return to a fuller appreciation of the living spirit of the Augsburg Confession. Then we will not walk in vain shadows but in the light of the truth; then we will learn that in a man's religion the thing that counts most is not what he offers to God, but what God gives to him.

There is more for our age in the Confession than the statement of the realities of grace. There is also many a warning against the errors that can help to obscure or push into a secondary place the central truths of God's Word. It has anticipated many of the dangers of our own day. In Article V is a warning against the prevalent idea that a man can get along without the church and receive the grace of the Holy Spirit without the appointed means. Article VI hits hard at those Lutherans, so-called, who are slackers in every good work and dream of an unreal faith that perceives without acting, that would always take without bringing forth any good works. Article VII gives the true basis of church union that is so persistently misunderstood and misapplied by the

partisans of unionism. Articles XVI and XXVIII define with all clearness the distinction between church and state, between law and gospel. Even Sabbatarianism is excluded, as well as the legislative lobbies of those who think, like Rome, that God's cause can be furthered by brute force and morality inculcated by penal codes. Articles XII and XVIII leave you in no doubt as to the deepest problems of the human soul as they speak of repentance and of the helplessness of man apart from God's grace. Yet a wild belief of the absolute freedom of the will, of man's ability to help himself and an inborn aversion to true repentance are characteristic errors of our self-sufficient age. That is the real reason why there is so much indifference; and the Confession tells of the only way to meet it—by telling men the truth. Article XVII warns against the silly errors of dreaming chiliasts who spend their time in computing some mythical hour of the Lord's coming, when they should be making ready their hearts for his daily coming in Word and Sacrament, and who amuse themselves with visions of a coming earthly kingdom, while they forget the supreme need of caring for the present Heavenly Kingdom. Many an unfortunate controversy of the past century might have been spared the church in America if all her pastors had stuck to the literal meaing of this declaration of the Augustana instead of trying to evade it. Articles XVIII and XIX have their warnings against the faction that would turn sin itself into a fiction or a mere aberration of behavior, and find means to overcome it in the exercises of pilgrimages or revivals, in penances or pledges, in the efforts of sodalities or brotherhoods. The good mixers and handshakers, hailfellows well met, and the apostles of the gospel of self-expression, well fed stomachs and taffy sticks, who like to whoop and hurrah men into glory must remember that no religious bacchanalians ever saved anybody. Only the sweat of Gethsemane and the blood of Golgotha have done so. Article XXII turns back to the pure customs of the Apostles and we have already indicated how its fundamental Scripture passage, Mt. 26:27, condemns some of the sacramental perversions of our own day. Those who are too lazy or whose congregations are too contrary to hold a separate service of Confession and Absolution, or

to provide for private confession before the Holy Communion should read Article XXV, while those who are superior to fasting should ponder Article XXVI; and all who are ready to defend or condemn, as the case may be, merely on the strength of an official declaration of the United Lutheran Church, or find the toleration by some ecclesiastical organization a sufficient excuse for evading Scriptural injunctions or confessional obligations, should study the principles of church authority defined in Articles XXVI and XXVII.

This Confession is the Magna Charta of our spiritual liberties. So long as we hold fast to its doctrine we shall be free, and true to the pure teaching of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic church. The church in her entirety and each individual teacher within her ranks needs to appreciate the binding character of the Confession, not as an external law imposed by human authority, but as a fruit of the Spirit of God, as a confession of the way, the truth and the life, that is grounded immutably on the eternal rock of Holy Scripture. We are not called on to amend it or improve it, but to learn it and to live it is our mission.

If we but do so we will not have cause to regret our allegiance, for others have looked longingly to our Confession and its teaching, appreciating its value even when they have not had the courage to subscribe its statements. The same Maximilian II of Austria, to whom we have referred before, when Selneccer presented him with a copy of his explanation of the Psalms, said: "Pray for me poor unfortunate, who would gladly live and die according to your faith as it is outlined in the Augsburg Confession."

THE STUDENT

WENDELL S. DYSINGER
Iowa City, Iowa

THE purpose of this paper[1] is to analyze certain general tendencies among university students. By way of introduction the influence of the home must be considered. In a real sense the student is his home. Much will be blamed on the university which ought rightly be traced to it. The immediate home control is gone, of course. But the knowledge is his, the habits are his, and the outlook and attitudes are taken with him. The constructive influence of the home is often stronger when home interference in details is impossible.

The home community is still the student's imaginal audience, applauding his successes, condemning his failures. Christmas vacation is more or less a parade. His campus triumphs will have preceded him, heralded by a fond mother and brother. He must defend his university and his gang. If his school was kicked out of the Big Ten, he has a wise-crack ready about the Holy Nine. If Wisconsin, where Bill goes, defeated his football team—there will be another wise crack in storage. The home town judgment day is a phase of the home consciousness of the student, especially the young student.

In high school days many young people are out of touch with the church. There are all degrees of variation from this general statement, but it is surely true that the work of religious education has been more effective among all younger ages. Some students barely have a church preference. Others have been members, though hardly active members. Others have had an active church relationship. An active church relationship may mean a personal experience of religion; it may mean submission to home insistence; it may mean social attraction; it may mean an outlet for the de-

1 Read before the Conference for Pastors of Students held at Chicago, Ill., Jan. 7-9 and at Briarcliff Lodge, N. Y., Jan. 30-31, 1930, under the Board of Education of the United Lutheran Church in America.

sire for leadership. At any rate, the high school age is usually the time when the youthful drift away from the home church reaches its peak.

The results of this situation are clear to the university pastor. There is an enormous amount of ignorance of elementary religious truth. Religious habits are often not formed, and religious attitudes lack vitality. Prayer is the refuge in times of great stress, but is hardly a habit. Church has been just taken for granted. The task of critical appraisal has begun, but is confined to the attitude of the church, especially of the minister, on the question of the recreation of the high school set. The science-religion argument has already appeared in a hazy form. University pastors often hear the complaint that students lose their religion during university days. For many of these students the loss is not great, since they did not bring much to the campus.

Of Lutheran students one must say that the general situation is more favorable. There is more knowledge and better church habits. There is a minority who revolt more intensely, too. The language problem, or other local problems found in Lutheran churches, are taking a toll among the young. The general tendency among Lutheran students is encouraging. There is loyalty to the church and to the Master. Even where students have come out of unfortunate home church conditions there is often a mature understanding of the situation. The church is rather taken for granted. But the work of religious education and home training has for the most part been commendable. The confirmation class has exerted a profound influence.

It seems essential to discuss more at length the institution of the confirmation class from the viewpoint of our university students. Both the strength and the weakness of catechetical instruction give their heritage to the student. As I analyze these subtle and pervasive influences, guided by student comment, the strength includes at least five factors: personal contact with the minister, mastery of elementary truths in religion, acquaintance with Scripture, home co-operation in religious training, and the beauty and joy of the confirmation service. When students report these ex-

periences in confirmation days, it most frequently happens that the student is finding religious adjustment in university days reasonably easy.

The weaknesses that students have reported to me are three in number: the labor of rote learning without understanding (sometimes in a tongue which was barely understood); the lack of interest or positive dislike (continued because of home insistence); and the narrow positions (from the viewpoint of the students), or the dogmatic manner of the minister in charge. One able student reported that the deepest impression that he had of confirmation days was that faith "was believing what you know isn't true." When students report in this tenor it is often a sign that religious adjustment is difficult. Sometimes, a later adjustment is satisfactory: and sometimes the attitude is best described by the word "revolt." The revolt does not come normally during confirmation days. This is due to the immaturity of the student, and the heavy social pressure. It rather comes later when this pressure is removed and allied problems have been discovered. I wonder whether other university pastors have not noted with me the high correlation between a pleasant confirmation experience and a satisfactory religious experience during university days. As I interpret it, this is one of the major factors in the religious training of the students who throng our campuses in the fall.

I STUDENT SOCIAL LIFE

An optimist would first discuss the intellectual life of the student. I choose to discuss first the social life. Here there is one central fact. Students live with students. Personal contacts are overwhelmingly with students from eighteen to twenty-four years of age. Thousands of students have no regular contacts with younger children. There are many of them who have only infrequent or ineffective contacts with the more mature. They meet their professors, sad to relate. It is a professional contact. The teacher has his grade book so near, and the faculty adviser has his card index so handy. There are, too, the parents of local student friends, where coeds spend the night in order to have a late

date. There may be the aged landlady, or the boss where one works. There is the sorority chaperon with her charming personality and her bell; the Y. M. C. A. secretary and the university pastor. Very important, there is the home letter. For many a student, this is the only intimate link with the more mature world. This is a fact of vital importance. Students live with students.

Much has been said about the revolt of youth. Amid considerable hysteria on the subject one truth seems to stand out. Youth today is looking more to youth for social approval. Mary smokes because it is expected of her,—expected by other young people, not by adults. Youth is looking to youth for approval. The difference on the campus is largely the multiplicity of youth's contacts with youth and the inadequacy of his contacts with the more mature. The dormitories, fraternity and sorority houses, the dance floor, the pool room,—they are full of young people. The class room unfortunately contains one professor. This situation only emphasizes the social dependence of college youth on college youth.

There is another important observation. Students are living in groups. The group may be organized or not, but the classification of the "in-group" and the "out-group" is a paramount fact of university life. These groups whether organized or not, have their leaders. There may be several "in-groups" within a single organization,—a single fraternity, for example. The student is loyal to his group. Loyalty may become so intense that students even study to keep the grade average high. The university pastor is usually in the "out-group," and finds the student "in-group" loyalty inconvenient. Yet, if the student is not loyal to his group, to what will he ever be loyal?

Student loyalty expands to become campus-wide. It is centered in athletic teams, but it embraces many other phases of university life especially in the presence of the enemy. Do not students thrill when the college hymn is sung! These university loyalties cut straight across the home town loyalties of earlier days. High school sweaters are simply not worn. Fraternity brothers come from the enemy town of high school days. All churches and

none are represented. Even Catholic prejudice relaxes within the group.

Thus the groupings of students quietly form a new epoch in the thought life of students. "Broadmindedness" is a favorite word. Really, the campus is highly parochial. Broadmindedness means the decay of former loyalties through a new series of familiar contacts and a new group of ideas. The home town pastor may sometimes blame this situation on the university church.

Social contacts are largely made through the various student groups. Some students have too few social contacts. Most students have at least an ample number. There are dances, and dates, feeds and bull sessions, committee meetings and church entertainments, card games and pool rooms, class meetings and games and rallies—you know the list.

To the student, these are highly important. Popularity is a word much used on the campus. Some students have "It." Popularity goes hand in hand with prestige. Popularity is for the individual, prestige is for the group. Campus standing is largely in terms of group prestige and personal popularity. Much campus ambition is centered in this normal desire for social approval. University pastors often find this social life a considerable interference. Many times we get the morning after the night before. Possibly more often we do not get it. The student reputation for irresponsibility is often related intimately to some phase of the social life of students. It is a big factor in university life.

The problem of campus moral standards is largely this social problem. Among the social affairs there are some parties that are "wet." The most definite line that can be drawn between a wholesome and unwholesome social affair is the line drawn between the "wet" and "dry" party. The hilarity and freedom of other social affairs may shock some. My guess is that there is far more moral principle among modern students on the social problems than many a critic has suspected. Hilarity is not to be identified with immorality: it is rather a safety valve than a danger. It is true that in the pursuit after a thrill, drunkenness and sex violation are tried out by some. Yet the general tendency as I see it is rather con-

demnation of these violations of fundamental morality. Personal ideals are mighty factors among university youth.

The group and its leader are very influential in moral questions. Some gangs and some organized groups contribute a real influence toward immorality. In some fraternities there is a long standing tradition that "a Gamma carries his liquor well." There are some sororities, if student opinion is to be trusted, where the thrill is held supreme above morals. It is usually true that such groups have bitter internal strife. National officers of organized groups exert a strong and wholesome influence.

II INTELLECTUAL LIFE

Students are of better than average mental ability. Some are brilliant. Others deviate in the opposite direction. The mass are "C" students. Churchmen often overestimate the brilliance of students. There are many serious students. Much time is spent in study. An estimate of twenty hours per week may be too high for the typical undergraduate. Yet there are many who study more than that. Good scholarship is highly respected. Good grades add to prestige. A professor is never entirely despised unless he combines with an unattractive personality a reputation for bad scholarship.

Many students respect good scholarship who do not have it. The art of "getting by" is substituted for study. Cheating abounds. The pioneer who wrote on the cuff of his shirt is a sample of the crude beginnings out of which the modern art has emerged. Flirtation is sometimes indulged by coeds who crave grade points without the expenditure of too much midnight oil. Thus, respect for scholarship often accompanies a superficial scholarship. Opinions are often merely infections. There is a frequent hesitancy to hold definite convictions. This chill of conviction is often born of the consciousness of superficial scholarship. The science-religion difficulty shows the same trend. Often, it is confined to the reconciliation of Jonah, Joshua and the opening chapter of Genesis to science.

If this interpretation does not flatter students very much, I

can only point out that the middle fifty per cent of students receive the grade "C." Yet the church should not lose sight of the importance of the gifted student to the church. He will see more problems and may have more difficulty. He also offers the greatest gifts to the church. A student program which offends him consistently and fails to satisfy his needs is a weak program.

Most students are quite critical of poor scholarship in high places. The church often suffers here. The student realizes now that the home pastor was not a good scholar. The sermon which is very emphatic and very obscure is now likely to be an extra offense. Ignorance cannot be atoned for by naming it religion. With this new prestige for the scholarly, the issue is sometimes drawn between faculty influence and church influence. Where faculty men assume some religious responsibility the student religious adjustment is much easier.

It has been said that "the university occupies the position of priest and prophet, the quickener of souls and the interpreter of God." This is most often true for the able student. The university pastor can be a part of this university environment. One student requirement is a reputation for decent scholarship.

III SCIENCE AND RELIGION

The science-religion argument among students is often superficial. Some are able to keep their minds well compartmented, so that science, philosophy and religion do not touch each other. At the other extreme are those who abandon all religion, on the surface at least. Sometimes this is quiet and modest. At other times it is revolt and the student becomes bitter. Sometimes it is merely blatant,—a social rather than an intellectual factor. For the mass, the whole problem is perplexing and confusing. The most obvious result is a relaxation in religious enthusiasms. The student needs an understanding approach. Any other approach is likely to divorce the independent student from the church, isolating the submissive student within the church.

The particular philosophies and scientific theories which influence students are the taboo theory of sociology, behaviorism in

psychology, evolution in biology, natural law in the physical sciences. It is impossible to deal adequately with these topics in a treatment which presumes to cover the broad field of this paper. In general, the student receives these theories on authority, as the student of theology is alleged to receive his beliefs. Some of them are accepted as proven facts, notably physical law and evolution. While most students know only the elementary phases, they are nevertheless real influences.

Some modern literature has influence. Students do not read the more substantial magazines. Yet there is considerable information concerning modern publications and recent books which filters down to the student body. Many times, these publications have weight far beyond their merits because the student does not have a wide background from which to read.

The Bible, God, immortality, prayer, the divinity of Jesus—what can be said of student attitudes? I shall dogmatically express my own opinion of the mass trend, begging your indulgence if my experience proves too narrow for such brief exposition. The infallibility of the Bible in history and science is rejected, but its vital power in moral and religious life is recognized. The question is hardly a central one, because students do not read the Bible much. Faith in the existence of God is the common fact. Student agnostics and atheists usually mean that they doubt or deny the bearded old man up in the sky. Usually, these attitudes do not of themselves lay hold on the deeper springs of action, though they serve some well as rationalizations for immoral living. Immortality is received with some modifications and some doubt. The traditional picture of both heaven and hell is modified. Some students reject immortality altogether. The more able students see the problems more frequently. One beautiful and capable girl, engaged to marry a minister, confessed to me once, "I believe that when I die, I rot." Other students deepen their earlier faith. Prayers of students usually center at the points of special life stress. There is influential student opinion that prayer is probably only suggestion, though most students equate their prayers with God. The divinity of Jesus, I am sorry to say, is usually passively

accepted. Jesus is a rather sorry figure with a weak, wan face. This is the worst criticism that I can make of the religious education they have received. That this dynamic personality forces men to face the question of his divinity is an actual discovery to most students with whom I have thought. Of the creeds students know little and care little. This widely advertised citadel of confusion is a point where students need guidance.

On most of these questions I would place Lutheran students in a more favorable light than I could students in general. I trace this largely to the institution of the confirmation class. Yet, where students revolt, the Lutheran student is often most bitter. Some have come from communities where there are two or more Lutheran churches whose relations to each other are something less than Christian. Some have come from language difficulties, or from churches where there has been a bitter lodge issue. When such students revolt, it is with a bitterness which challenges the most tactful approach. This is the minority reaction,—a small minority, too. Yet it is a real factor in the life of that minority. Of the majority, I must say that the interest in religious questions is very real and that the religious interpretation of life is often supreme.

IV ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF STUDENT LIFE

Students are dependent. A few pay their own way; a few at the other extreme are parasites. Most are honestly dependent. There is a striking contrast in the economic position of students. Some are very poor, foregoing much comfort to get an education. Some live in luxury beyond their high school dreams. Modern fraternities and sororities are palaces. Mortgages of fifty thousand dollars are common. Automobiles are numerous with this class. Most of them are held together with bailing wire, but they do succeed in carrying their wise-cracking sides around the town,—and farther.

The influence of too much luxury is bad. The handicapped student is the one with the Chrysler roadster and the allowance of two hundred dollars or more per month. If such a student ever achieves in scholarship or character, it is not the parent's fault.

Gambling in large sums has little place on the campus. It is confined to students with considerable money. There are many games of cards for smaller amounts of money and considerable betting on games, especially football games. Pool is most often played for "who pays." This can hardly be considered a major moral problem with the great maority of students.

Petty thieving is a campus problem. Usually, it is probably caused by some economic stress. It may be a new search for a thrill with some. The number of students involved is probably small.

V EMOTIONAL STRESSES

The thrills of living give one side of this picture, and the stresses of living give the other side. Of thrills, we have spoken briefly. They are mainly social. Among the blasé, they call for indulgence in all the emotional experiences of life. Most students seek pleasure and prize highly the newly discovered thrill, but draw a clear line on the basis of moral restraint.

One need not be a popular Freudian to recognize this sex problem as real stress. Marriage is artificially postponed by economic pressure and social pressure. The students are physically mature. Among professional students and graduate students this factor often involves stress over a period of years.

A second class of student stress is sorrow and disappointment. The care-free student is not entirely a myth, yet he is far from typical. There is much student sorrow. Death may have entered. A love affair may have broken the heart. There is much student disappointment. Class room failures are disappointing. Failure to "make" the best fraternity or sorority often brings deeper disappointment. Sometimes, students come face to face with a problem even harder: self-confident youth must face the fact of his own mediocrity. It is his first glimpse into the irrevocable. Students often find distress, sometimes deep distress, in religious life. Students appreciate sermons on the problem of sorrow at least as much as do adults, and probably more, for the issue is so new and baffling to youth.

Closely related to the emotional stresses of student life is the future of the student. It means to him a life partner and a vocation. Any adult who tries to read himself back into the mind of the student must rid his thought of definite decisions on these two vital questions. This is the great gulf which separates youth from maturity.

The question of a life partner provokes a smile, if not a laugh. Yet it is probably the most important decision of the student's life, especially of the girl's life. Students have this question in mind. Some go to college in the expectant hope of finding a partner of the right sort. More students meet their new friends with a less aggressive interest, though the interest is still there. Coeds especially are prone to be conscious of the possibility of "meeting my fate." A few students claim to be man-haters or woman-haters, though not all such testimony is convincing. The great body of students are making desirable social contacts, with this thought not infrequently in mind, and with a considerable stress involved from time to time. No student should be treated unsympathetically who approaches an adult with this problem.

The question of a life vocation is in many ways similar. There is much indecision. Even those who have chosen a vocation definitely have made only the first of a considerable number of vocational choices. Many avoid the question; they do not know how to approach the study of so vital a topic. Too often the choice of teaching is only a substitute for a real choice. Professors are not above the criticism of urging special vocations more to build up their own college in the university than to aid students. Ministers sometimes use undue pressure in gaining recruits for the ministry.

Vocational choices are often greatly influenced by incidental experiences in life,—a doctor is admired, for example. Sometimes the decision is merely a question of the most income for the least work. No great character was ever built out of decisions of that type. There is abundant room for constructive help from the church in this field.

Much mental stress is endured by students who must face these problems. The stress is only increased for those who find it hard to face them directly. On the other hand, the stress is relieved by the student discount. He may run away from his problem to a game of bridge or a round with the fellows. Only a few of the sensitive are crushed. Most students experience the stress periodically. The relief is so satisfactorily indulged that many observers know nothing of the real stress involved in these phases of student life.

VI RELIGIOUS INTERESTS

What is here to be said concerning the student attitude toward religion has special reference to Lutheran students. This does not imply that the task of Lutheran university work is limited to Lutheran students. Ideally, our work is limited only by the needs to which the Master can minister. The immensity of the task, however, and the limitations of our support, restrict the non-Lutheran work. Our primary responsibility is for the Lutheran student.

The religious interests of students are very real. Among their friends religion is often not made as vocal as other similar interests. There is a deep aspiration which is centered on God. There is a real desire to service which inspires many a Christian student.

With this must be mentioned a widespread student doubt. It is a phase of student interest in religion. Sometimes it is a necessary step in making over a second hand religion into a vital experience. Sometimes it is the first step toward irreligion. Much depends upon those who influence the student during university days. It appears to be largely a transition stage. Careful information on the later developments of student lives would be intensely interesting.

Atheism and a crystallized agnosticism are not major problems, so far as the mass of students are concerned. They are not atheistic. The students who represent the exceptions to this statement are normally mechanists, influenced by some field of science. Mechanism seldom captures the deeper springs of action.

There are some students who feel that the whole religious approach to life is irrelevant. It is about the same as the "one world at a time" attitude. They are merely indifferent. It tells much about man's religion that it can be crowded out. This trend is emphasized by the confusion of students regarding their religious beliefs.

As to the religious organizations of the campus: the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., and kindred organizations, vary so widely from one school to another that a brief general statement is difficult. Sometimes one wonders whether students look upon the organization as religious at all. It is rather a campus political plum. At other times, they reach with an inspiring message a small group of students. Most students know little of the work of these organizations.

Chapel is not often held in the university. Where chapel is conducted, especially where it is required, a serious responsibility is placed on the leader. Too often chapel services are extemporaneous and meaningless. The Vesper services of the universities are puzzling. Relatively few students attend, though the speakers may have national reputations. The disastrous courses include those taught by negativists, and those taught in an unscholarly manner or in an obnoxious manner.

Much of the influence from such organizations and institutions is indirect. An atmosphere of friendship or antagonism is created in the student body. The consequences of this are often more influential than the content of the religious service or the course.

The church is the major religious institution in the mind of the student. There is much loyalty to the church among students. Even in criticism the underlying loyalty is exposed. Lutheran students respond heartily to the church program, considering the artificial life of the student and the inadequate provision often made for the work. The church has a far greater opportunity at the university than has yet been realized.

Two student criticisms of the church call for notice. The first is the morality of church members. Many students have been alienated from the church by the lives of active church people in

their home communities. We may feel that this is a superficial criticism, yet it is an oft-discussed phase of some home churches.

The second criticism is more subtle, and manifests itself in indirect ways. It is the church reputation for special pleading. The jobs of ministers depend upon their acceptance of certain dogma. The words of the church are thus often interpreted as the words of a pleading lawyer, not the testimony of a reporting witness. It is felt that the church is unwilling or incompetent to make a disinterested examination of its own position. One student of psychology made the prejudice vocal: "I do not study dreams, I belong to the church."

Denominational division and its defense is often interpreted with the discount with which we hear the pleading lawyer. Students favor the union of Lutheran branches. Many students do not know the difference between Lutheran bodies, cannot tell what national body they belong to. They have little sympathy for the historical backgrounds out of which these divisions have come. They are looking more to the future.

Further, exclusive Lutheranism is not for the typical Lutheran student. Many of them would favor the union of Protestant churches, though they have little appreciation of the implications of this position. They have little sympathy with interchurch strife or intolerance.

If we can achieve a better understanding of students in our discussion, we shall have taken one essential step for the university pastor. Here they are. Many of them are indifferent to the question whether we understand them or not. We are adults. They are looking to youth, to scholarship, to social life for success during college days. We can never know them intimately unless we stand ready to pay the price. Their demands seem to be less exacting than the challenge of the Master. These are the professors of the colleges of tomorrow, the doctors, lawyers, teachers of a day not yet born. The business of the future will be carried on, in large part, by the university men of today. The church that sees and meets the opportunity offered today at the university is the church which will hold the strength of tomorrow.

FAITH, DOUBT, AND REASON

ROSS MILLER
Springfield, Ohio

WHENEVER I meet a fact, reaction results; for living itself entails reaction. Only dead things do not react to environment. Among the facts of my environment to which I, a living man, am exposed, is the fact of God. This fact inevitably evokes from me some kind of reaction or response.

Now my response before this fact of God is my religion. My religion is my response before that which I conceive to be the Ultimate. Religion involves both creed and conduct—both what I think about Reality and how I act regarding Reality. This is true because both thoughts and actions are responses or reactions: thoughts are only actions not yet become visible, that is, they are implicit; actions are only thoughts which have become visible, that is, explicit. Thoughts are unseen actions; actions are visible thoughts. Thus what I think about God, and what I do toward or regarding God together constitute my religion.

These thoughts of mine about God are my beliefs. They matter; for if I entertain them long enough they become visible actions. Thoughts and actions are of a single piece. Thoughts inevitably father actions. Will is based upon attention. In the end, I act as I think. Moreover, I am, literally, what I think; "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." I am what I believe.

Even if I were to deny the existence of God, still that denial would be my belief about him—a negative reaction, to be sure, but a reaction, a thought, a belief, nevertheless. Such negative beliefs, such denials, do not destroy the fact which they deny at all. My denial of a God does not destroy the fact of God. God continues to exist just as certainly as though I were reacting toward him in a positive way. So it is that negative, destructive beliefs are not only useless, but they are dangerous as well, seeing that they isolate

me from the Reality which is my environment. And isolation from environment is death. My beliefs do indeed matter. I must decide between a negative belief and a positive one; and I must make my decision even if all the testimony in the case is not yet in. Perhaps I feel that an absolutely final decision must be withheld until I know everything about the case. But I shall never know all about God; the exploration of God is an eternal adventure. I must base my decision upon partial knowledge.

Day by day, I must meet life, I must make decisions. And if tomorrow's increase of knowledge gives me the privilege of changing my decision of today, God be praised. I thereby testify to the fact that I am still learning. Perhaps on the day after tomorrow I shall have advanced sufficiently to change my mind yet again, but each day's decisions must be made upon that day's knowledge. And each day brings necessities of deciding, which can not be postponed, seeing I am, at least partly, alive.

By experience I learn that life is more abundant for me if my decisions are positive ones. Negations to facts are poor foundations. They are, indeed, nothing and can not therefore be built into my life's foundations. If I remove my existing foundation, as I am continuously doing as I displace inadequate knowledge by new facts, I must be putting something in its place, or else I have no foundation at all. Negations can not furnish me with a life-foundation.

On the other hand, if, upon the best available information, I accept a positive belief it is obvious that I must then act as if that belief were true. I can then step out bravely and unafraid. Upon all the facts at my disposal, I have made a decision; I can now carry on with courage and confidence.

In addition to the courage and confidence which come to me as a result of my making a positive decision, there results a unification of my life which issues into a satisfying peace. Until my positive decision is made, my personality is constituted of an indefinite number of competing selves, each capable of becoming my master. As long as these selves or sentiments remain unordered, and until one of them becomes my dominant master sentiment, I

am a divided personality. But as soon as I accept one of these ideals as my own, as soon as I surrender my Self to it, and subordinate the other sentiments of my personality to it, as soon as I concentrate all my energy upon realizing it,—that is, until I espouse a cause worthy of my whole Self, worthy of a man, I am restless.

The various sentiments of my personality, each of which is a possible master within and over my personality, are constituted, each one of them, of a person, thing, or idea, along with the inevitable affective accompaniment thereto. My sentiment of home, for example, is made up of all my experiences of home, each of which has had, as it entered my experience, an affective tone to it. The resultant element within me, that is, my concept of home and the accompanying affective element associated with that idea, is my sentiment of Home.

The only sentiment which is worthy and capable of gaining the allegiance of my whole Self, must surely be a personal one. Only a person can possibly carry enough prestige as it were, to be the master-sentiment, or Ideal, of another person. I, a person, can not surrender my Self to any something. My ideal must be some person.

Of all the persons whom I have met, there is only one who is able to command my eternally unfailing allegiance. To be sure, there are, in the course of my life, many persons upon whom I successively shower all the personal characteristics which I have discovered by experience to be "good." But as I come to know these persons better, I make always the same painful discovery that they are not really the possessors of all these good traits which I had enthusiastically ascribed to them. My idols get broken. As each successive ideal thus goes the way of all the earth, I am driven back, step by step, until I come to one whose character does not break when I get intimate with it. There is only one such person. His character stands up amidst the stormy attacks of two thousand years. That person is Jesus. It follows, it seems to me, that Jesus is, after all, the only person who is capable of eternally being my ideal. Jesus alone, the only perfect character I know, is able

to be my permanently unifying Ideal, never failing me because of any unexpected manifestation of imperfection in his make-up.

The last idol to submit to breaking is the sentiment of my own Self. I love it so consistently, though so unreasonably, that, in order to keep it on its idolatorus pedestal, I must continuously rationalize about it, defend it without any basis for so doing, and make myself blind to all its faults. But this is just what I do do. I love my own Self to the last. My self-love is the last of my false ideals to surrender to an ideal which really is worthy of my love. But when I come to know my Self, and am willing to evaluate myself honestly, sincerely, and correctly, even this idol breaks, and I am once more sent out upon the search for a hero or a personal ideal which is irrefragable. There is left only one other to try. As a perfect, everlasting, unbreakable ideal, He has never yet been found wanting: no flaw has ever been found in the character of Jesus.

A positive belief in Jesus, therefore, permanently and satisfyingly unifies my personality. No other ideal can. This satisfaction resulting from this eternal unification is the "peace which passeth understanding." It is the result of the permanent resolution of conflict within my personality, the establishing of an emotional harmony by "accepting Christ."

On making such an Ideal my own, and concentrating my whole energy upon realizing it, I find that my character is strengthened, for my energy is no longer scattered among several competing possibilities, nor is it wasted upon any merely temporary ideal. The concentration of my energy upon a single sentiment makes my character strong.

To be sure, I can unify my personality around an evil ideal; in which case my character is evil, but strong nevertheless. I can, with Milton's Satan, say, "Evil, be thou my good,"—and my character will be strong and evil as was the character of Satan in "Paradise Lost." But since evil is in the last analysis self-destructive, a character unified by an evil ideal can be strong only temporarily. Strength of character based upon an ideal which is doomed to destroy itself can not outlast the destruction of that

ideal. On the other hand, the concentration of my energy upon a sentiment which is permanent and worthy, makes my character permanently strong.

There is within normal man, therefore, a need for an ideal, for an object of worship, which shall prove itself to be permanent. "As the heart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God." Belief in a God is psychologically necessary, for a normal man.

Such a positive faith in God issues into a sense of fellowship with him. In this sense of fellowship with Ultimate Reality, there is an element of "super-logic." Just as Kant's imperative was categorical and final, so this sense of fellowship has an element of a higher reason.

This super-logical element is not, however, peculiar to religion. There is, even in mathematics, this super-logical element; for a mathematical axiom exists only when it applies to some reality which is already accepted. A geometric proof, for example, starts with some such words as these, "LET the triangle ABC be a right angled triangle": behind the proof there rests an accepted reality which is more ultimate than the proof itself. So in this sense of communion with God, there exists an element which is above logic and reason, and precedent to them.

Such fellowship means action, life. These highest things can not be spoken; they can only be lived. And God, who is at least the summation of all the best which man can imagine, can not be spoken; he can only be felt, appreciated, known directly. Though this experience of God is incapable of utterance, still, it is capable of being acted. Love can be known only when it is lived. Ultimate Reality can be known only when acted. God can be known only when love is lived. Living love is knowing God. Living a godly life entails loving; loving entails knowing God.

This direct knowledge of God, this conscious knowing of God in Jesus, this "Christian Experience," this "spiritual intuition," or whatever name be applied to it, is dependable. For, in the first place, it without doubt furnishes me, the possessor, with a new power for living, and dependability means, surely, dependability

for life. Furthermore, it must be considered dependable, because I react as a unit, as a whole, and my emotional reactions are just as trustworthy as my rational ones; indeed, my reactions can not be classified as "emotional" and "rational" at all. When I reason, it is I who do it, not some part or faculty of mine which is my "reason." This direct knowledge of God, which is obviously not an accomplishment of my reasoning, comes to me supra-rationally, but just as dependably as does any other knowledge. "His spirit beareth witness with our spirit." Indeed, in any act of knowing, there is this intuitional, this purely subjective, this direct element.

If the knowledge of God comes to me supra-rationally, what place has reasoning in the process of finding God? Reasoning is the process upon the plane of ideas, of trying out, in the imagination, the various possible claimants for my choice of an ideal. I imagine myself as I would be if I were to choose the various sentiments which are competing for the mastery within and over my personality. Reasoning is this process of trial and error on the ideational plane. Among the various possible claimants for my choice is the sentiment of Jesus, constituted, as are all my other sentiments, of all the experimental elements which have entered to make up my idea of Jesus, and also all the affective elements which have accompanied each of these experiences as they have become parts of my life history.

Doubt, then, is the unpleasant affective tone, the unpleasant condition of suspense and indecision during this process. It continues until the trial and error series is terminated by a voluntary choice of a master sentiment on the part of my Self or personality. Doubt persists until my personality is unified by and under a master sentiment, until order is brought out of the chaos existing among my competing selves. Doubt thus precedes unification. Doubt really precedes permanent belief. A "belief" without a doubt precedent to it, is not a belief, but rather a superstition, gullibly accepted. A Faith, a Belief, is based upon reasoning, which process is accompanied by an affective unpleasantness called doubt. Doubt is displaced by the satisfaction of a belief.

Reasoning is thus a process; it needs raw materials, stuff, with

which to work. These things with which I work when I reason are ideas, or sentiments, or ideals. Now, since ideas are not innate —since I do not have any ideas at birth, but must get them by experience, it follows that before I can reason about God, I must experience him. I can reason about him only after I know him; I can not reason to him. I can reason about him only after he has come to me and I have consented to make his acquaintance. Knowledge of God must precede reasoning about him. Experience precedes reasoning, furnishing me a material with which I work when I function rationally. Reasoning can not arrive at God; it falls short.

Reasoning, however, does create a god-like hero or ideal, constituted of all good personal characteristics which I have experienced in concrete individual cases. When I discover that no human person whom I meet really does possess all the good traits which I, as a hero-worshipper, have, in my ignorance, ascribed to him, I must imagine such a person; that is, I make a god in my own image. Constituting him are such "good" characteristics as kindness, truthfulness, etc., traits which I have isolated from any accompanying badness in the personalities in which I found them, and then collected into my self-created paragon. But, while I was experiencing these good traits in persons, I was, to the limit of their purity, experiencing God. He is, through kindness, embodied, to the extent of that trait, in that person who manifests kindness in action. Thus, if there were not God, I should be forced by my very nature to create one—one who would embody at least all those characteristics which I, by experience, have learned to evaluate as desirable. Atheism is psychologically impossible.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND STATE LAWS

MARTIN SCHROEDER
Bloomfield, Nebraska

ON the seventeenth day of last November a press report from Washington, D. C., brought the news that "the first comprehensive attempt in history to define a policy to govern relations between the federal government and education" had been begun with President Hoover's sanction.

It is very doubtful whether the far-reaching implications of this announcement are at present fully realized by those agencies which will primarily be affected by a readjustment of the administration of education in America. Heretofore state and local authorities have defined educational policies for those under their care. The possible consummation of a federal department of education, however, will most likely carry with it a national standardization of pedagogical means and methods.

The greatest effect of a change in this field will probably be felt chiefly by those who are engaged in the dissemination of character education, and in particular among those who have based their training courses on a religious basis.

During the past quarter of a century great advances can be seen in making the sublime teachings of the Scriptures available to ever increasing numbers of public school children. Will the proposed department wipe out all favorable legislation and exclude the Bible from all tax-supported schools; or, shall those sovereign states which today rule against the Bible in their accredited curriculum be compelled to give up their state rights and introduce what they do not want?

For such reasons there are many who view the educational development of our nation with misgivings. These lines are written to give a comprehensive survey of the existing practices of using God's Word.

That the problem of character training is of nation-wide importance is evidenced by the seemingly never ending enacting, checking and balancing of laws intended to that effect. Character education has become the battle-field where otherwise unsympathetic factions of the body politic fight shoulder to shoulder for principles which they claim to have in common. There are those who desire to give their ideas of moral instruction the fullest possible sway under the law, while others see their duty in repressing the organized efforts of any movement to bring moral training within reach of the average child in our public schools.

The question was never overly stressed up to about 1875. It was only with the rise of the common or public school that the thought of character training began to assume the proportion of a national problem. The custom of using Protestant prayers, singing of hymns, and using the generally accepted translation of the Bible was not thought of as interfering with the welfare of the community, and therefore it was continued in spite of the schools assuming more and more the character of free and open-for-all institutions. The thought prevailed among the majority that a school which would leave out the teaching of morals would only produce a generation of women and men without the necessary moral stamina. Not opposition to the best type of education has caused the critical attitude toward moral training in our public schools, but rather, as it was said of the origin of the federal constitutional provisions for religious freedom, "disagreement and fear."[1]

The tensity of the situation began to grow during the years following the Civil War, when the Democratic party, according to Karl Zollman,[2] became involved, though silently, in furthering the Roman Catholic viewpoint of popular education. This viewpoint was officially represented in particular by the Congregation of Propaganda, which is "the department of pontificial administration charged with the spread of Catholicism and with the regula-

1 S. Mendels, "The Constitution and Religion," *Green Bag*, 14, 4110.
2 *Church and School in the American Law*, p. 6.

tion of ecclesiastical affairs in non-Catholic countries."[3] This department issued in 1875 an " 'Instruction to the Bishops of the United States concerning Public Schools,' in which it was pointed out that the public schools as conducted involved grave dangers to the faith and morals of Catholic children, and that consequently both the natural and divine laws forbade the attendance of Catholic children at such schools, unless the proximate danger could be removed."[4] In some dioceses it meant exclusion from the sacraments for parents to send their children to the public school.[5] Such practices made the question a national issue, and it was taken up by the Republicans.

In an address, September 29, 1875, at Des Moines, Iowa, President Grant declared: "Encourage free schools, and resolve that not one dollar appropriated for their support shall be appropriated to the support of any sectarian schools. .... Keep the church and the state forever separate."[6] Shortly after, in his seventh annual message delivered to Congress, he suggested to "oppose a successful resistance to tyranny and oppression from the educated few, ... whether directed by the demagogue or by priestcraft." He furthermore recommended to submit a constitutional amendment to forbid in our public schools the teaching of "religious, atheistic, or pagan tenets, and prohibiting the granting of any school funds, or school taxes .... for the benefit or in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination,"[7] To the very end President Grant urged the principle of free and universal schools. His second term expired March 4, 1877. In his farewell message he advised the nation again, that the states should be obliged to furnish a good common-school education to all, that the attendance of children should be made compulsory, and that no sectarian creeds nor tenets should be taught in any school.[8]

While the Democratic party refrained from mentioning the

3 *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913), XII, 456.
4 *Ibid.*, XIII, 580.
5 *Ibid.*, XIII, 581.
6 Carl Zollman, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
7 *Congressional Record*, Vol. 4, Part 1, p. 174.
8 James G. Wilson, *Makers of American History, General Grant*, p. 309.

issue in state or national platforms, the Republicans kept to their plans of attaching another amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which however failed of becoming law, owing to failure to secure the necessary two-thirds majority.[9] But the agitation was not without consequences. While before 1875 only two states, Wisconsin[10] and Nevada,[11] provided in their constitutions that no sectarian instruction should be given in public schools, the states which have been admitted into the union since that time have included in their constitutions provisions to assure a public school system free of sectarian influence.[12]

Closely related with the tendency to check sectarian activities in public schools is the prohibition of using public funds for sectarian schools. As far as legal provisions are concerned, most of the states have eliminated the possibility of either using public school property, or appropriating public funds for the furtherance of sectarian purposes. A typical illustration of such provision is contained in the Constitution of the State of Nebraska, which reads:

> No sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public funds set apart for educational purposes, nor shall the state accept any grant, conveyance, or bequest of money, lands or other property to be used for sectarian purposes. Neither the State Legislature nor any county, city or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation from any public fund, or grant any public land in aid of any sectarian or denominational school or college, or any educational institution which is not exclusively owned and controlled by the state or a governmental subdivision thereof. No religious test or qualification shall be required of teacher or student, for admission to or continuance in any public school or educational institution supported in whole or in part by public taxation.[13]

9 *Congressional Record,* Vol. 4, Part 6, p. 5595.

10 *Wisconsin Constitution* (1848), Art. 10, Sec. 3.

11 *Nevada Constitution* (1864), Art. 11, Sec. 9.

12 Colorado (1876), Art. 9, Sec. 8; North Dakota (1889), Art. 8, Sec. 147; South Dakota (1889), Art. 8, Sec. 16; Montana (1889), Art. 11, Sec. 9; Washington (1889), Art. 9, Sec. 4; Idaho (1890), Art. 9, Sec. 6; Wyoming (1890), Art. 7, Sec. 12; Utah (1896), Art. 10, Sec. 1; Oklahoma (1907), Art. 1, Sec. 5; Arizona (1912), Art. 11, Sec. 7; New Mexico (1912), Art. 21, Sec. 4.

13 Art. VII, Sec. 11, Constitution of 1920.

Provisions such as this complete the citizen's safeguard of his "natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of one's own conscience."[14] At the same time educational facilities are assured which were formerly taken care of by the church, exclusive of the religious aspect. Again, the Nebraska constitution may be quoted as typical in this respect, as it provides that it is "the duty of the Legislature to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction."[14]

Only two states, Maine and Georgia, differ from these general provisions for separation of church and state in the field of education. The latter declares that nothing contained in its public school provisions shall be construed to deprive schools of the state, not common schools, "from participation in the education fund of the State, as to all pupils therein taught in the elementary branches of an English education."[15] Maine, whose constitution was adopted in 1819, makes it the duty of the legislature "to encourage and suitably endow from time to time, as the circumstances of the people may authorize, all academies, colleges, and seminaries of learning within the state."[16] Thus one sees that, in spite of the absence of a federal, specific law, the prevailing national sentiment favors strict observation of the separation of church and state in the field of education, and consequently omits from its educational program religious instruction.

Inasmuch, however, as education of children, viewed apart from political concepts, would seem normally to include religious instruction, as it is historically demonstrated, certain allowances have been made by a number of state legislatures in favor of reading of the Bible, and the dismissal of children to receive religious instruction during school time. This is done chiefly on the assumption that morality and democracy are inseparable, if the latter is to persist.

14 *Ibid.*, Art. I, Sec. 4.
15 *Constitution of Georgia*, Art. 8, Sec. 5.
16 *Constitution of Maine*, Art. 8.

According to prevailing legislation covering the problem, the different states may be arranged into three groups, namely: (1) states making Bible reading compulsory; (2) states which permit it specifically; (3)states which permit it in general terms or through silence. There are no states in which legislation forbids Bible reading.

Considering the first group one finds that the law of Maine is the most explicit in regard to compulsory Bible reading in the public school. It states:

> To insure greater security in the faith of our fathers, to inculcate into the lives of the rising generation the spiritual values necessary to the well-being of our and future generations, to develop those high moral and religious principles essential to human happiness, to make available to the youth of our land the book which has been the inspiration of the greatest masterpieces of literature, art and music, and which has been the strength of the great men and women of the Christian era, there shall be in all the public schools of the state daily, or at suitable intervals, readings, from the Scriptures with special emphasis upon the Ten Commandments, the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon, the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer. It is provided further, that there shall be no denominational or sectarian comment or teaching and each student shall give respectful attention but shall be free in his own forms of worship.[17]

The General Laws of Massachusetts provide:

> A portion of the Bible shall be read daily in the public school, without written note or oral comment; but a pupil whose parents or guardian inform the teacher in writing that he has conscientious scruples against it, shall not be required to read from any particular version, or to take any personal part in reading. The school committee shall not purchase or use in the public school books favoring the tenets of any particular religious sect.[18]

States vary in their provisions for the reading of the Bible. There is for instance a difference in the amount to be read each day, the specifications of the reading matter, and the possible dismissal of the teacher in case of non-compliance. The following citations will speak for themselves and the states in which they are in force.

17 *Laws of Maine* (April 4, 1923), Chap. 166.
18 Chap. 71, Sec. 31 (1921).

Delaware requires that "in each public school room in the state, and in the presence of the scholars therein, at least five verses from the Holy Bible be read at the opening of such school, upon each and every school day, by the teacher in charge thereof."[19] New Jersey makes use of the same words as Delaware, but adds that only the Old Testament may be used, and this without comment.[20] Florida: "All tax-supported schools shall read once every day the Bible in presence of pupils and report that it is done before payment of salary is made."[21] Georgia: ".... the Bible, including the Old and New Testament shall be read in all the schools of this state receiving state funds, and not less than one chapter shall be read at some appropriate time during the school day."[22] Kentucky: "The teacher in charge shall read or cause to be read a portion of the Bible, daily, in every class room or session room of the common schools of the State of Kentucky, in the presence of pupils there assembled, and no child shall be required to read the Bible against the wish of his parent or guardian."[23] Pennsylvania: "At least ten verses from the Holy Bible shall be read, or caused to be read, without comment, at the opening of each and every public school, upon each and every school day by the teacher in charge."[24] Failure to do so results in discharge of the teacher.[25] Tennessee follows Pennsylvania in its phraseology, but adds: "Provided, the teacher does not read the same chapter more than twice during the same session." Likewise is the teacher warned to meet this requirement by danger of losing his position, and also, pupils may be excused upon written request of the parents.[26]

The second group of citations present the states in which reading of Bible is specifically permitted. Indiana leads as far as brevity of statement is concerned: "The Bible shall not be excluded

19 *Laws of Delaware,* Chap. 179, Sec. 2.
20 *Compiled Statutes of New Jersey* (1916), 185-479.
21 *Florida Cumulative Statutes* (1925), 487 (10).
22 *Georgia Code* (1926), Chap. 4, Art. 3, Sec. 2.
23 *Kentucky Acts* (1926), Chap. 113, Art. I, 4369h-1.
24 *Pennsylvania Statutes,* Sec. 5093.
25 *Ibid.,* Sec. 5094.
26 *Compilation of Tennessee Statutes,* Vol. 1, 1447a1-3.

from the public schools of the state."[27] Iowa follows the latter state in conciseness, but adds "nor shall any pupil be required to read it contrary to the wishes of his parent or guardian."[28] While Kansas laws provide that "no sectarian or religious doctrine shall be taught or inculcated in any of the public schools," they nevertheless safeguard at the same time some form of devotional exercise by declaring that "nothing shall be construed to prohibit the reading of the Holy Scriptures."[29] Ohio laws follow the reasoning of some of the court opinions, passed on this question, and this provision has been inserted in the General Code of Ohio: "A regulation requiring the reading of the Bible as an opening exercises in school is valid, and the courts have no right to interfere therewith."[30] This law however works both ways, for, "if a board of education has passed a resolution under this section prohibiting the reading of the Bible and prayer, or other religious instruction in school, its action is final and it can not be reviewed by the courts."[31] North Dakota makes a double provision, so that at least the Mosaic Decalogue may become a familiar piece of literature to the children of the state. Leaving the use of the Bible to the judgment of the teacher, the law decrees: "The Bible shall not be deemed a sectarian book. It shall not be excluded from any public school. It may at the option of the teacher be read in school without sectarian comment, not to exceed ten minutes daily." But no pupil shall be required to participate contrary to the wishes of his parents.[32] No exception, however, is made in impressing the Ten Commandments upon the youthful minds, for the law requires: "It shall be the duty of the authorities in each school in the state, which is supported by appropriations or by tax levies in this state, to display a placard containing the Ten Commandments of the Christian Religion in a conspicuous place in every school room, class room or other place in said school where classes convene for

27 *Indiana Statutes* (1926), Sec. 7069, (March 6, 1865).
28 *Laws of Iowa,* Sec. 1764.
29 *General Statutes,* Sec. 6284.
30 *General Code of Ohio,* Sec. 4750.
31 *Board of Education v. Paul,* 7 O. N. P. 58; 10 O. D. (N. P.) 17.
32 *Laws of North Dakota* (1927), Chap. 247, 1388.

instruction." The cost of this equipment is taken care of by the state.[33]

The third group, comprising the largest number of states, in respect to their legislative attitude, permit the reading of the Bible in their public schools in either general terms, or express their acquiescence through silence, leaving it to local authorities or the courts to decide whether constitutional guaranties are being violated. The law of Mississippi presents a fair example of general provisions. It states:

> A suitable course of instruction in the principles of morality and good manners, prepared by the state board of education shall be used in all the public schools of the state. Such course shall include what is known as the Mosaic Ten Commandments, and may be graded with the idea that a certain amount of time will be devoted to it in each grade. No doctrinal or sectarian teaching shall be permitted in any public school in the state and no pupil shall be required to take the course provided for herein when the parent or parents or guardians of such pupil shall so request in writing filed with the superintendent or teacher.[34]

In Ohio, to illustrate the situation when specific legislation is absent, the entire matter of Bible reading, or religious exercises, in the public schools is altogether within the province of the local school board. In 1873, after a bitter fight, the Supreme Court gave a decision in confirmation of this principle. The court's right to interfere in the management or control of the schools was denied, and the board's right to pass and enforce its regulations was sustained.[35] No legislation has ever been passed in Ohio to interfere with this decision. The ensuing practice is pictured in an editorial in the *American Israelite* of February 19, 1925, which reads in part:

> In Cincinnati some of the school principals have availed themselves of there being no regulation and are excusing the children for one hour during the week to attend a religious school. However, this is not compulsory; the permission is granted only upon the receipt of a written request from the parents. About fifty per cent of the children are excused to attend religious

33 *Ibid.*, Chap. 247, 1.
34 *Mississippi Code*, Sec. 8977 (1924).
35 *Board of Education v. Minor*, 23 Ohio St. 211.

instruction in compliance with such requests, each of them going to such teachers as their parents prefer. As this matter has never been referred to the local school board, no official action has been taken. In some of the counties of the state not only has Bible reading been introduced, but Christian, that is Protestant, religious services are being held.[36]

The practice in Nebraska presents a further illustration of those states where legislatures have taken no action, and the courts have given the right to decide to the local educational authorities. Although the constitution of that state plainly sets forth that "no sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by public funds,[37] the court has held that

the law does not forbid the use of the Bible in the public schools; it is not proscribed either by the constitution or the statutes; and the courts have no right to declare its use to be unlawful because it is possible or probable that those who are privileged to use it will misuse the privilege by attempting to propagate their own peculiar theological or ecclesiastical views or dogmas. . . . . Whether it is prudent or politic to permit Bible reading in the public schools is a question for the school authorities, but whether the practice of Bible reading has taken the form of sectarian instruction is a question for the courts to determine upon evidence.[38]

Other states in which a similar attitude prevails in regard to the legality of Bible reading in the public schools, according to information gathered and given by the United States Bureau of Education[39] are: Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. The total number of states, inclusive of the District of Columbia, therefore, in which the law is favorable in one way or another to the reading of Bible is forty-one. At the same time these states make allowance that no one shall be compelled to be present at such reading against the wish of parent or guardian.

36 Quoted in *The Sectarian Invasion of Our Public Schools,* by Rabbi L. I. Newman, p. 48.

37 Art. VII, Sec. 11 (1920).

38 *State v. Scheve,* 65 Neb. 853.

39 Quoted in *Bible Society Record,* 72 (Dec. 1927), 12-201.

However, the use of the Bible in the public school is not the only problem of church and state in the field of education. Closely related to it is the practice of dismissing pupils from public school to attend classes in religious education, but the number of states having specific legislation in this respect is small in comparison with the former problem.

The provisions for dismissing children from public school to attend classes in religion are characteristically different from those regulating the reading of the Bible. While quite a few of the latter regulations make use of the imperative, the provisions now under consideration are purely permissive. They declare that children "may" be granted the privilege of attending religious instruction during public school hours. The Minnesota law is the most explicit in this respect. It provides:

> Children may be excused by the school board of the district when it is the wish of such parent, guardian, or other person having control of any child, that he may attend for a period or periods not exceeding in the aggregate three hours in any week, a school for religious instruction, conducted and maintained by some church or association of churches, or any Sunday school association incorporated under the laws of the state, or any auxiliary thereof, such school to be conducted and maintained in a place other than a public school building, and in no event, in whole or in part, at public expense.[40]

The Oregon law reads thus:

> Any child attending the public school, on application of his guardian or either of his parents, may be excused from such school for a period or periods not exceeding 120 minutes in any week to attend week-day schools giving instruction in religion.[41]

The State of Ohio's law in this respect is as follows:

> The Board of Education .... may in the rules and regulations governing the discipline in such schools, prescribe the authority by which, and the manner in which any child may be excused for absence from such school for good and sufficient reasons.
>
> The Department of Education may by rules and regulations prescribe

40 *Minnesota Statutes* (1927), Sec. 3080.
41 *Oregon Laws of 1925*, Chap. XIX, 1.

conditions governing the issuance of excuses hereunder which shall be binding upon the authorities hereby empowered to issue them.[42]

South Dakota follows the words of the Minnesota law, but allows only one hour a week instead of three as it is the case with the latter.[43] North Dakota grants a total of six months absence which may be taken in one or more years.[44]

Bills contemplating the dismissal of children for religious instruction in recent years failed to become law in California,[45] Colorado,[46] Indiana [47] and Wyoming.[48] The Indiana Legislature had passed the act, but it failed to become law, because the Governor, upon the advice of the Attorney General, did not sign it. The act was held unconstitutional because, although the constitution imposes the duty to encourage moral improvements,[49] the Attorney General considered that "religion" was not specifically mentioned in this section. He pointed out four reasons why he declared the act unconstitutional:

(1) Technically it was not properly introduced. (2) It violates the sections in the bill of rights of the Indiana constitution which provide for religious freedom, ... (3) The act provides for state regulation of schools conducted for the sole purpose of instructing in religion, ... (4) It is significant that in Sec. 1 of Art. 8 of the constitution, which requires the Legislature to provide by law for free common school education, the duty imposed was limited to encouraging moral, intellectual, scientific and agricultural improvements.[50]

To these arguments the opposing attorneys replied:

(1) That he was mistaken in claiming that the bill is in violation of the constitutional provision regarding the manner in which a bill should be introduced. (2) That he errs in holding that the bill was a discrimination in favor of some kinds of religion and against others, and a violation of religious freedom. The excusing of children two hours a week is not compul-

42 *Ohio General Code*, Sec. 7763.
43 *Laws of South Dakota of 1923*, Chap. 167, Sec. 7642(3).
44 *Laws of North Dakota of 1927*, Sec. 1342.
45 *Assembly Bill* (1925), No. 128.
46 *Senate Bill* (1925), No. 142.
47 *Senate Bill* (1927), No. 46.
48 *Senate Bill* (1925), No. 48.
49 Art. 8, Sec. 1.
50 *Research Service in Religious Eucation* (Dec. 1926), 9.

sory but volitional..... If it is legal to permit some of the children to be excused for full time to attend schools maintained and established for religious purposes, it would be constitutional to permit them to be excused two hours a week. (3) The bill does not provide for the regulation of religion, but only for the regulation of attendance..... (4) ..... Because religion is not mentioned by name is no assumption that 'instruction given in religion would not be knowledge, learning, moral or intellectual.' Many other subjects have been introduced into the schools without having been specifically mentioned in this provision. Furthermore, the obligation placed on the General Assembly to encourage education by all suitable means, does not limit such encouragement to that only which is being done by the public schools.[51]

Opposition in California to proposed legislation of like nature came largely from the Jewish clergy. Their position is set forth in detail in a fifty-five page pamphlet by Dr. L. I. Newman, Rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, San Francisco, California. A comparison will serve as an illustration of the similarity of underlying thought in the contest. Dr. Newman's and his sympathizers' argument is summarized in the paragraph which is as follows:

We are opposed to the so-called Miller Bill (No. 128, Assembly, California State Legislature) for four main reasons. First, we oppose it in principle, as contrary to the spirit and teaching of our American system of public education and of church and state. Second, we affirm that, in practice, it will create chaos in the administration of our public schools; it will involve teachers, pupils and parents in situations embarrassing to their personal religious opinion. Third, we deem the bill entirely unnecessary, inasmuch as those who desire religious instruction may secure it after school hours; the method suggested implies a wrong approach to the whole problem of religious education; the churches and synagogues ought to strengthen their own resources from within instead of appealing to the Legislature and other law-making bodies for assistance and pressure. Fourth, we believe that the sentiment of liberal religious leaders throughout the entire country will be found to be opposed to any intrusion into our public schools, and that the more we discuss plans such as the Miller Bill suggests, the more the opposition will crystallize, and in the end defeat any project to overthrow our established system of public secular and private religious instruction.[52]

Arguments to this effect have been advanced in similar in-

51 *Ibid.*, p. 10.
52 *The Sectarian Invasion of Our Public Schools* (1925), p. 5.

stances where the question of dismissal of children from public school to receive religious instruction has arisen. Their valuation and validity is effectively demonstrated in judicial decisions and interpretations bearing upon the subject.

How the President's commission will discharge its duty of defining the government's relation to education is a matter of speculation. Documentary evidence, the result of years of governmental research is at their disposal. Arduous tasks, extending over the past two decades, have been accomplished, but the desired workable definition of the federal government's relation to education as it is controlled by the states has not yet been found. The conflicting attitudes in the various legislative halls all over our nation, as presented in this article, show to the reader the hurdles which the advocates of a national department of education will have to clear.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE DIVORCE QUESTION

RAYMOND T. STAMM
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

THE attitude of Lutherans towards the marriage of divorced persons has been receiving considerable discussion recently. It is generally recognized that the church must be guided by a thorough, inductive study of the contemporary economic and sociological factors involved. Yet many hesitate to make such an investigation basal, because they fear that it may lead to conclusions out of harmony with the New Testament. Others, who have arrived at conclusions or adopted practices based on the results of such a study, justify themselves by attempting to show that Scripture permits, or at least does not prohibit their point of view. The consequences are sometimes unfortunate, alike for an accurate historical interpretation of Scripture and for a scientific solution of the problems which confront the family in the twentieth century.

The difficulty is neither new nor strange. It is as old as Christianity itself. Tertullian, against Marcion's insistence that Christ had forbidden divorce absolutely, objected: "What will a husband among you do if his wife has committed adultery? Will he keep her?" He pointed out that not even Paul, Marcion's apostle, had "allowed the members of Christ to be joined to a harlot," and his conclusion was that divorce when justly deserved had Christ as a defender. Origen inquired whether Jesus forbade the divorce of a wife detected, not in fornication, but in witchcraft, infanticide, murder, or theft. To him each alternative appeared unreasonable: it was unreasonable to put up with sins which seemed worse than adultery and fornication, but at the same time it would be impious to act contrary to the meaning of our Savior's teaching.

Suppose, now, that historians were to show that the weight

of evidence is against the view that the celebrated exceptive clause of Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 was spoken by Jesus. Which horn of Origen's dilemma would one choose? Doubtless many, like Tertullian, would still reason that since there are cases in which righteousness demands divorce, and since Christ was righteous, he therefore must have permitted divorce. But is Origen's dilemma really necessary, and is Tertullian's reasoning based upon a tenable conception of the function of Scripture in the Christian life today? Is there not another way out of the difficulty, which will at the same time meet the demands of the developing Christian conscience and find in Scripture the inspiration necessary to realize the ideals of family life set forth therein?

Fortunately there is such a solution. It lies in recognition of the fact that Jesus was not legislating, but setting forth an ideal, and that his teachings are not to be treated as a code of laws from a second Mt. Sinai. Being statements of the inevitable results when man violates the fundamental conditions of his existence, they leave each new generation free to devise the detailed ways and means of living in harmony with them.

It was precisely at this point that Christianity broke with the technique of salvation employed by Judaism. The Pharisees, idealistic as they may have been, were constantly hampered by their conception of Scripture. They believed that in the Torah the whole will of God had been revealed for all time, and that one had only to study it sufficiently and turn it over and over again in order to be able to derive from it legal prescriptions to govern every conceivable situation in life. By looking at their results, however, one can easily see that what they actually did in innumerable cases where their changed circumstances and growing ideals came into collision with their static written code was to read those ideals back into it.

Such use of Scripture, however, is open to certain grave objections. From the moment that men get hold of the concept of development it becomes invalid for them. Worse still, it may be the means whereby evil men succeed in blocking progress in dealing with existing wrongs and in lifting human life to higher levels.

It turns the light from the study of observable contemporary facts and shunts the current of spiritual energy off through innumerable dead side issues. It wastes time. To be sure, it does serve to check the harebrained experimentation often proposed by the lunatic fringe of movements for social progress; but surely this same end can be achieved by more scientific means.

Against the legalistic system which had thus painfully been deduced and grounded by the methods of current exegesis, Jesus asserted the direct claims of the prophetic conscience. His religion began as a religion of the Spirit, and in all subsequent ages his followers have had need to remind themselves of this fact, resisting the temptation to treat his teachings and the writings of his followers in the old rabbinical fashion. It is safe to predict that today neo-scribism in dealing with his teachings concerning divorce would be found even less satisfactory than was its ancient prototype in its attempt to keep the laws of Moses applicable to the difficult conditions of Jesus' day.

The difficulties which they faced were in some ways similar to our own. From the days of the Maccabees to the disaster under Hadrian, constant wars, or threats of wars, with their attendant political tension and economic distress, wrought havoc with Jewish family life, and the evil was aggravated by the demoralizing effects of the competing moral standards which came in with the conquering Graeco-Roman civilization. So common had adultery become that the "water of bitterness" (Num. 5:11-31), which was supposed to determine doubtful cases, was no longer used. At the same time the new ideal of greater harmony in the marriage state became a contributing factor in the increasing laxity of divorce.

Although the recognized grounds for divorce were too numerous, and often trivial, Jewish sentiment was, in the main, strongly opposed to it. Mal. 2:16 was much in pharisaic thought, and the Pharisees, at least in the case of a man's first wife, are credited with the spirit and practice of the principle, "What the Lord hath joined, let no man put asunder." Their method of controlling divorce was to add to the necessary legal formalities. One way of hindering

a would-be divorcer was to apply the severest rules in estimating the pecuniary rights of the wife—often the most effective check.

As legislators and administrators of law, the Pharisees were concerned with what was practical. The law, whether in its written form or in its oral development, was only a general minimum of good conduct, and their legal statutes are not to be equated with their ideals. Then, as now, laws were adapted to what was considered a practical general demand, and many of the Pharisees, both in theory and in practice, went beyond them.

The school of Hillel was inclined to interpret the law so as to accommodate it to the increasing laxity of practice. Not only unchastity, but any action by a wife tending to bring her into suspicion, was held to be a ground for divorce. The point of argument with the school of Shammai was the interpretation of two words in Deut. 24:1, which, translated literally, mean "a shame of a thing." The Hillelites stressed the word "thing" and interpreted it as unchastity *or* something else. They found cause for divorce in such things as spinning or eating on the street, giving the husband food from which the tithe had not been taken, refusing to lend her winnowing fan, her mill, or her oven: in short, any conduct which might bring the husband into disrepute. Barrenness for a period of ten years or failure to meet the physical or other qualifications called for in the marriage contract—all this and much more was included in this omnibus "thing." The followers of Shammai stressed the word "shame," and restricted divorce to a "matter of unchastity."

A moment's reflection will make clear the effect of this kind of legalistic debate over the application of particular words of Scripture, upon creative vision in dealing with the ever changing conditions of family life. That was not Jesus' way of using Scripture. It was, indeed, his spiritual guide; it influenced him profoundly, and he did not disregard it; but neither did he hesitate to bring his intuitive moral judgment and his ideal of godlike perfection to bear upon it. He read Deuteronomy in the light of Genesis, quoting Moses against Moses, and he viewed the passage (Deut. 24:1 ff.), which got into the way of his ideal, as a retro-

gression, insisting that it was a concession to the "hardness" of men's hearts. The ideal was what he was concerned with. To him no legal act or judicial formula could affect marriage, because it was fundamentally a spiritual relation. There is such a thing as treating his teachings, which applied immediately to the peculiar conditions of his day, in the same scribal fashion as Moses was treated, with the result that the spirit is choked with the letter.

Jesus set the ideal of marriage so high that in every age multitudes of his followers have despaired of its practicability. The reasoning of Tertullian and Origen suggests the manner in which the exceptive clause came to be added. Briefly stated, the grounds for this view are these:

Paul carefully distinguished his own advice concerning marriage from the specific instructions of the Lord, which he quoted to those already married. The Lord's instructions were that a wife is not to separate from her husband; that if she does separate, she must either remain single or become reconciled to him; and that a husband must not divorce his wife (I Cor. 7:10-11). Now while Paul did not apply these instructions strictly and without exception to marriages in which only one party was a Christian, he nevertheless did not quote a word of the Lord as authority for his procedure. On the other hand, since he considered marriage the lesser of two evils, in view of the near approach of the end of the world and of the potential trouble in mixed marriages as foci of persecution against Christians, it would have been altogether natural for him to seize upon a saying of Jesus as his "authority" if such saying there had been. As it was, he reasoned that since God had called Christians to live in peace, separation might take place, provided the initiative came from one who was not a believer: in such cases the brother or sister was not a slave (I Cor. 7:15).

The exceptive clause is also absent from Mark and Luke, who, like Paul, must have been under pressure of conditions which seemed to call for it. The fact that they do not have it constitutes a firm basis for the view that the addition of the exception is rather to be explained by the peculiar local conditions for which Matthew,

under the guidance of the Spirit, was written. In view of the enormous practical difficulties in the way of the realization of Jesus' ideal of marriage, this is the interpretation which best accounts for the facts. Moreover, if Jesus had made exceptions, it is difficult to understand the dismay of his disciples as revealed in their petulant observation, "If the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry" (Mt. 19:10).

It has been held that since the question of the Pharisees turned on the interpretation of Deut. 24:1 ff., actual adultery was not involved in the discussion, because it was to be punished by death, and not by mere divorce (Lev. 20:10). This is specious reasoning. But when one reflects that the very severity of capital punishment for this offense tended to make it extremely rare and to substitute divorce for it, the argument becomes quite inconclusive.

If these conclusions be accepted, a very practical question at once arises. In the absence of grounds for divorce in the teaching of Jesus, how are Christians today to deal with the matter? It is a question that will certainly be asked by those who are deeply concerned to do what is right, but who are convinced that there are circumstances under which more harm would be done if divorce were impossible. Just as in the days of Origen and Tertullian, so today, in certain cases, it is felt that divorce is right and therefore that "scriptural grounds" exist for it. But in the interest of a growing Christian conscience in the matter—a conscience which surely we believe to be under the immediate guidance of the Spirit today as well as in the past—it is vitally important to be free from the limitations which result from minsconceiving the utterances of Jesus as laws to be enforced, rather than as ideals to be realized by the best means which modern social science can devise.

The proper principle is that of the reciprocal interaction between Scripture and the growing Christian apprehension of the ideal family life controlled by the Spirit of Jesus. This means that what the Bible has to say about divorce must be interpreted in the light of the concept of development, that is, in the light of things as the Spirit of God through our growing human experience gives us to see that they ought to be. We must go to Scripture, not for

detailed directions for legislation which must apply to situations which have hundreds of new and complicating factors as compared with the conditions under which the writers of the New Testament lived, but for that inspiration of the Christ who is portrayed there which will make men willing to pay the price in human effort by which alone the ideal married life can be achieved.

No mistake could be greater than to treat the teachings of Jesus as legislation, whether prohibitive or permissive. He was setting forth ideals; he stated the moral and spiritual consequences of failure rather than legal penalties: if for any cause a man divorce his wife, the permanent union intended by God is broken and the ideal is missed, in that the potential personalities which might have been developed are now forever impossible.

We are witnessing in many quarters a resurgence of the ancient and time-worn device of preserving self-respect by legalizing moral shortcomings. Every proposal for dealing with our present situation must be tested by asking whether it really is a means to the achievement of the ideal of godlike perfection, or whether it is nothing more than some ancient tragic mistake clamoring for repetition. Any neo-scribal use of the teachings of Jesus will obscure the ideal and play into the hands of those who would tone it down to conform to current practice.

Jesus went beyond even the best thought of his day. He stressed the original divine intention of permanency. His unerring ethical insight led him to put his finger upon a weak spot in the thought and practice of rabbinical Judasim. One element of this weakness was that the advantage in securing a divorce lay always with the husband. It was his prerogative solely. To be sure, the wife might enter a complaint, and the courts might bring pressure to bear upon the husband to give her a divorce, but even then it was by a legal fiction made to appear as *his* action. Moreover, so long as another man's wife was not involved, breaches of the marriage tie did not come under the category at all; for polygamy, though increasingly rare, was permitted. All this shows that woman was considered as property, rather than as a person, and as a means rather than as an end. Jesus refused concession to

the disintegrating factors which were blinding men's vision of the ideal.

We do well to follow him in this, rather than to seek minute directions in his teaching to govern our attitude toward modern legislation. To find in his words explicit directions for dealing with every modern contingency is in the nature of the case impossible. For we have to deal with a multitude of factors which did not exist in the environment in which Jesus lived; and concerning certain abuses which did exist among his people there is no record that he spoke. Thus, for example, while he assumed an attitude which was destined to level the inequality between man and woman in the matter of divorce, his age was not ready for a specific attack upon the concept of the wife as property, whereas it is precisely the abandonment of this concept, and the recognition of her rights as an independent personality no longer necessarily dependent economically, that is the occasion for numerous divorces today.

Again, Jesus assumed that God had joined husband and wife at the very moment of creation; but his age did not ask and he did not answer the question *how* God was joining a particular man, A, with a particular woman, B. It was a comfortable Jewish doctrine that marriages were made in heaven. But how? What were God's human instruments? The parents, perhaps? Judged by the results, men saw that God himself was not always successful—the Rabbis said that joining couples in marriage was more difficult for him than parting the Red Sea. Some marriages were so bad in their results that only a reference to Satan could explain to them their tragic failure.

The true solution is to be sought in that conception of God which thinks of him as working in and through human society. It can come only as men seek to discover and conform to the conditions of their own well-being. To be successful in this we must hold fast to the ideal of Jesus, and at the same time feel free to adopt by legislation or otherwise whatever means are recommended by the best information and principles which our modern social sciences can furnish. If divorce should then commend itself in extreme cases as the wisest means of achieving the ends of per-

sonality and of safeguarding society, we may feel free to adopt it; but—remembering his ideal—we shall do so only when all other means both of prevention and cure have been exhausted.

From earliest childhood we should begin preparation for marriage by preventing the formation of attitudes and habits which will later be disastrous to the marriage relationship; we should seek to relieve economic and social strains, such as parental interference, which break up homes; we should uphold in all its sharpness of outline the ideal of Jesus; and finally, if in spite of these measures, there are occasions when marriages are threatened with disruption, we should devise ways and means of reconciliation whenever possible. Divorce should be only the last resort, an admission of utter failure, such as Jesus conceived it to be.

BOOK REVIEWS

JEREMIAH THE PROPHET[1]

In his *The Modern Use of the Bible* Dr. Fosdick tells how, in his efforts as a boy to read the Bible through, he "stuck in the middle of Jeremiah and never got out." "I do not blame myself," he added, "for how can a boy read Jeremiah in its present form and understand it?" "Neither, for that matter, can anyone else," says Dr. Calkins, and we all say "Amen." The text of the book of Jeremiah is the cause of Jeremiah's failure to be a really popular prophet with modern Bible readers. Dr. Calkins' aim has been "to make a straight path through these tangled chapters; to trace the development of the prophet's character and message from the beginning of his life to its end, and to show that 'a braver, gentler and more exquisite or more courageous soul has not often walked the earth.'" In this aim the author has had commendable success. He has made a painstaking rearrangement of the text, about which there is now a fairly general consensus of judgment. He has also written the story of Jeremiah with striking sympathy. Under his pen the character of "the weeping prophet" unfolds in impressive unity. We follow the timid, shrinking youth as under the spell of a great personal experience he becomes an ardent pleader for his God, throwing himself enthusiastically into the Deuteronomic reform, then quietly waiting for thirteen years for fruits meet for repentance, only to be disillusioned in the stormy days of Jehoiakim, but anchored in the discovery of a personal God and the precious truth that God's covenant is written upon the fleshly tablets of the heart. The story of Jeremiah makes uncomfortable reading for those who have no place for the individual conscience in national crises. No more devoted patriot ever lived than Jeremiah, but he was not a chauvinist. His patriotism made him the inveterate foe of the national policy of Jehoiakim. "The reader may weary of these reiterated complaints," says the author. "But if we weary of them Jeremiah did not." We may call him "God's Hammer."

Dr. Skinner finds that Jeremiah is deficient in love; the author finds Jeremiah's "one thing lacking," in common with all other Old Testament writers, the hope of personal immortality. It is a very suggestive thought. Eternal life was not to be discovered but revealed. Of all the prophets Jeremiah was "likest Christ," and yet the least in the kingdom of God was greater than he.

H. C. Alleman

1 By Raymond Calkins. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930. xvi + 382 pages. $2.50.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND MODERN RESEARCH[1]

A long series of notable volumes from the pen of Professor Adolf Deissmann, of Berlin, well known in English translations, such as his *Bible Studies, Light from the Ancient East, Paul,* and *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul,* as well as personal contacts with him by many American students in Berlin and by leading churchmen in this country in various international conferences in the interest of present-day Christianity, make it unnecesary to introduce the author of this little book. The fact that Professor Deissmann has combined a fine New Testament scholarship with a deep personal interest and practical participation in many of the most important undertakings of the modern church, both in his own native Germany and *im Ausland,* gives this present volume greater interest. Here we have the Haskell Lectures delivered at Oberlin College from April 10th to 17th, 1929, and they are reproduced substantially in the popular form in which they were then delivered.[2] The popular lecture style necessarily limits the range of the investigation to those things which may be easily set forth to a popular audience, so that, while the scholar will be disappointed because the ground has hardly been broken in most cases, the general reader without technical Biblical training gains thereby. He can read this book which surveys almost the whole field of modern New Testament study, by an author who has had no little part in the task, with ease from beginning to end.

Professor Deissmann surveys in a vivid fashion the origin of the New Testament, its language, its place in world history, and its historical and religious values. So far as its origin is concerned, the Christian movement arose first; it then produced the New Testament piece by piece in response to needs in the various historical situations. At first the movement was non-literary. Jesus did not write; his words and deeds were remembered by his disciples and written down when the eye-witnesses began to die; many attempts to write down the words and deeds of Jesus have perished; the best ones were saved by the church. But only a bare fragment of what Jesus did and taught has been preserved. In the main the Gospels are accurate records of Jesus, but there are evidences of the influence of the experiences of the disciples after Jesus died in shaping the things preserved and possibly in adding some things to them.

To the non-literary period also belongs the Apostle Paul. His writings were mainly personal letters not intended for publication, written hurriedly while working at his trade or in travel, with no idea or intention whatever

1 *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research.* By Adolf Deissmann. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., Inc., 1929. 193 pages. $2.00.

2 Chapter V, "The Historical Value of the New Testament," was also delivered as a lecture at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., Mar. 21, 1929, and was published in the Lutheran Church Quarterly, Vol. II (July 1929), pp. 257-70.

that they would later be collected and become a part of the sacred literature of the church.

There followed upon this non-literary beginning a period in which Gospels began to be written and collected; then the letters of Paul were collected; so that the Gospel *corpus* and the Pauline *corpus,* bound together by the Acts of Apostles, come to be the pillars in the structure of the New Testament.

The third period in the history was exactly the collecting of the books and the struggle over which one should be included in the canon. This struggle was long and bitter; the church of Rome for a long time would not accept Hebrews and the churches of the East would have nothing to do with Revelation; by the fourth century the New Testament as now received was practically determined, although Professor Deissmann notes that the position of Hebrews in the New Testament is not entirely certain even in our own day.

The most interesting chapter to the reviewer was that devoted to the language of the New Testament, in which is sketched the brilliant triumph of modern scholarship, by means of inscriptions, ostraka and papyri dug from the sands of Egypt, in showing that the Greek of the New Testament is not a "sacred language" entirely different from any other Greek ever written or spoken, as the older classicists have held, but is the popular everyday language of the common people all around the Mediterranean of the first century.

This linguistic triumph supports other historical data both within and without the New Testament in establishing the fact that early Christianity came out of the ranks of the great masses of the common people. Not Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, but the peasantry of Palestine; not the Stoics, Epicureans and Neo-Platonists, of the Greek world, but the vast multitudes of those in the still lower stratum of society; out of these Christianity arose. Though Professor Deissmann strangely leaves unmentioned what modern research has revealed about the religious and social conditions of that part of first century life which we usually call the Gentile world. A great field, with many implications for the story of the rise of the New Testament, has within the last decade or two been opened by such scholars as Reitzenstein, Case, Angus and Willoughby, not to mention Deissmann's own researches.

The reader will rejoice to note the large degree of historical reliability found by Deissmann in the New Testament; especially in view of the fact that he frankly discards the old idea of verbal inspiration. The dogma of inspiration did not belong to the writings at first, when the only sanction or assurance of validity was the warm experience of the Spirit in the hearts of believers; it came rather with the development of ecclesiasticism, with the rise of the Catholic church; and the great ages of the church have been those in which all dogma and theological speculation have been subordinated to the personal experience of struggling Christians of the Christ in their hearts. And so it is from this point of view that Professor Deissmann proceeds to use all that historical research can contribute to the understanding of the origin of

the New Testament; rejecting the idea of verbal inspiration because it did not belong to the writings at first, and because it reduces the writers to mere mechanical writing machines, he sets out to learn the historical facts of what actually happened.

But historical investigation has its limitations; the religious values of the New Testament do not depend upon such investigation. They are discovered rather by the individual as he reads the words there recorded and opens his soul to the Spirit of God. In this mystic experience the human spirit recognizes its kinship with the divine Lord, who is still just as active and alive as he was when he lived in the flesh, and just as accessible. It is clear therefore that Professor Deissmann has not by any means given up the very ancient dogma of inspiration. What he has done is to give up the idea that the dogma of inspiration can be demonstrated or validated by historical research; and instead he validates it in a mystic experience. This escape from the uncertainties of research may make one question the value of all the tremendous energy that has been expended in research, and again he may be troubled when the psychologist begins to study his mystic experience. We here face the issue of the relative validity of the two pursuits of truth which we call rationalism and mysticism. Professor Deissman concludes: "But there is not a single word of Jesus which can in no place and at no time be a divine revelation for a man" (p. 190).

SELBY VERNON MCCASLAND

Professor of Biblical Literature,
Goucher College, Baltimore

THE MIND OF ST. PAUL[1]

The subtitle to this volume indicates its specific approach: A Psychological Study. The author is professor of psychology in the University of Pennsylvania. A Foreword is written by the eminent student of Paul, F. J. Foakes-Jackson, who states as his opinion that he "should be in no wise surprised if this book proved itself to be an epoch-making attempt toward a true estimate of the Apostle to the Gentiles." The book purports to dissect the mind of Saul-Paul on the basis of the data, findings and theories of *modern* psychology.

It must be admitted that such a task as here attempted is not only difficult but daring, since it involves an adequate acquaintance with the source-material on Paul as well as a similar appreciation of the spirit, method and data of modern scientific psychology. Professor Jackson's commendation of the book is supposed to guarantee the reliability of the historical data and sources; the author's own academic standing, the trustworthiness of the other.

1 By Arthur Holmes. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929. 263 pages; index. $2.00.

Promising as this may seem, however, the book fails most conspicuously to meet the high expectations which circumstances seem to hold out.

In the first place, Professor Jackson recommends this study even though he admits that he has but "an amateur's acquaintance with psychology." That he risked too much in such a commendation he will soon learn from critical reviews of the book at the hands of competent students of modern psychology. In the second place, in spite of Professor Holmes' association with a great university, this book plainly shows that the author had failed to give the kind of account expected from a teacher of modern psychology at such an institution. That he seems utterly to lack the adequate appreciation of what modern psychology aspires to do (and expected in such a volume) is surprisingly evident. In support of this criticism I cite two instances.

Saul's conversion experience is summarily discussed as follows:

> In general, then, having faithfully examined physical causation, or the scientific method of explaining events, we conclude that physical causation, and hence, scientific explanation, fails in accounting for the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. We must look further for an explanation (p. 156).
>
> If, then, a revelation to St. Paul is our last resort after all other means have proven themselves inapplicable to this case, we must ask from whom it came? **Not from matter,** for matter never speaks a meaningful message to matter, causes do not communicate ideas to their effects. Not from any other human being; for no other person on earth knew the idea communicated. Not from Saul himself; for the idea was never before in his mind. The only tenable theory seems to be the Apostle's own assertion that it came from above, from some divine agent or agents (pp. 207-8).

If the first quotation be true, the author has given his whole case away. A psychological approach (according to the spirit and method of a modern scientific psychology) is impossible! We ought not to call such a study, then, "psychological" in the modern sense of the term, but rather "philosophical" or perhaps "religious." Moreover, to identify the scientific approach with physical causation wholly, is to assume that *all* science is materialistic; to do this is to reveal a lack of appreciation of such a method. For, all that the scientific approach asks is that the antecedent-consequent chain of relations (whether these be physical or non-physical) be sought out in every event, and that the law of parsimony be not violated. To appeal to a supernatural factor (or to say, as in the second quotation, "from above") is perfectly legitimate on philosophical or religious grounds; but such an appeal ought to carry the proper name. If the author finds that a psychological study is impossible, why name it such? The use of psychological terms, and the book is full of them, is no guarantee that the approach is psychological. It would have been far better to have written a much briefer account and made it ring true to the alleged approach than to have gone beyond such an approach under a misguided label. Dogmatically, he seems to assert, in the second quotation, that there was no immediate antecedent factor in the mind of Saul to account for

his new insight. But to make such a claim is at once to part company with a legitimate assumption of all scientific procedure. To say that no one else "on earth" knew the idea communicated, lacks that scientific caution which we expect to find in a modern psychologist.

Such an evident misunderstanding of now well-recognized branches of human disciplines detracts from whatever merit this volume otherwise may possess. The book of twelve chapters closes with a quasi-devout poem!

VERGILIUS FERM

THE GOOD LIFE IN A GOOD WORLD—HOW?

The Quest of the Ages by A. Eustace Haydon[1] is a philosophy of religion from the standpoint of an extreme humanist. There is in it an insistence on the value of religion in the life of mankind. The insistence is equally strong that mankind will need the inspiration of religion in the future. No appeal could be finer than that made in this book for the birth of a new world organization with a spiritual ideal (p. 232). One who is in entire disagreement with its fundamental position can yet learn from it the things that a really Christian social program ought to make its goal so far as concerns human betterment in this world.

Having thus shown sympathy for the spirit of the book and its purpose, the reviewer can not but feel that the book misses, or gives but little place for, what is the chief thing in religion. Again and again religion is defined throughout the pages of this book as the "quest of the ages for a good life shared in a good world." The idea of gods, much less that of God, is, in accordance with this definition hardly regarded as essential to religion (pp. 99-100). Buddha is cited as an illustration of such loose connection of the idea of the gods with religion as is also Confucianism. In both cases, one could, on the contrary, argue that these philosophically-minded founders of a new religion wanted to banish the gods but ended only in being deified themselves. The gods are said by the author to have come in as an afterthought to help man in realizing a social good. How this accords with the ascetic strain—so vital a part of religion—we are not told. Because the gods were found to serve a social purpose, cults, scriptures, priesthoods and all the benign institutions of religion are said to have arisen. The main thing, however, we are told, is not the gods but "the good life shared in a good world."

This minimizing of the place of the divine in religion stands in such striking contrast to the facts of religion, which insist rather on seeing the divine everywhere, that one wonders whether a philosophy of religion so selective of one part of religion and so oblivious of its main factor can be regarded as in any degree an adequate explanation of it. It is in line with this selective

1 New York: Harper Bros., 1929. 243 pages. $2.50.

approach by the author, that he argues for a religion without the dualism that puts man and God over against each other. Its standpoint seems to be: keep religion but divorce it from any faith in God or in a divine order, for "the dream-world of the unknown beyond" is said to be "a chapter of the history of religions that seems to be definitely closed for thinking men" (p. 167). One is grateful for the modicum of modesty in this dictum that it only *seems* to be closed.

And what is to wield authority in the new religion that is to be, for that there is to be authority is admitted. This is in "the method of science." Evil is maladjustment. Science is to be the instrument to correct all maladjustments, individual and social. Men are said to have lived under the delusion that there is another world. To make this world good—that is the quest of the ages. The implication is, of course, that if one believes in another order he can not work for the good of the present order—the either-or fallacy of which this is another illustration.

To return to the author's viewpoint: the good life in a good world can only be attained by the method of science. "The vision of the quest of the ages grows clearer now. To the social sciences we are turning for clarification and for knowledge" (p. 148). "There is every reason to hope that the method of science may be the effective guide and authority for the religious quest" (p. 199). One can not but admire the faith of the author—now indeed turned away from God to a method, and that a method of science. Science however will not of itself produce this good life in a good world, but we are asked to use it and apply it and so become its creators. Here is where its humanism becomes conspicuous. To the thoughtful the question will still recur: What is this transcendent creative power, even if it is called humanism, that is to produce the good life in a good world? Is it not after all a substitute for that which the devout mind has through the ages known as God?

When asked the ultimate question, Who is to take this spiritual leadership of mankind? the author is strangely compelled to turn to the "organized forms of religion, bearers of the ideal of the ancient past" (p. 231). No particular religion is in the mind of the author. The fact is that he seems specially partial to the Hindu religion. (See p. 158 and p. 182.) That organized religion is to take the spiritual leadership but abandon its main belief —that in God—this seems to be asking it to do a work and take away from it the only tools with which it has shown in history that it is able to work.

The reviewer read the book with interest as he read Walter Lippmann's *Preface to Morals* some time ago. Both these books are written from the humanistic standpoint. Both want to keep real social values but abandon the sanctions on which they ultimately rest. The better way would seem to be to conserve what has been found to work. Dr. Mott made a statement recently that nine-tenths of secularism can be claimed as an ally of Christianity.

While not claiming so large a proportion of the humanism presented in this book, all that makes for "the good life in a good world" can not only be claimed by it, but is at the very center of its message of the kingdom of God. Make a social good the main object in a program of world betterment and you miss it; put men in right relation with God and the social good will inevitably follow. We share with the author the hope for such a better world. Our hope is however not in any human invention but in the God who has put at our service all material and spiritual resources and invites us to become co-workers with him in the divine enterprise. Thus used, the book may be to us a much-needed reminder that in this task we are to make fuller use of all the aids that science has made and will continue to make available. What we fail to see is why there is any need to deny God in order to make such use of science. Rather would we hold to the rule that has worked through the ages, Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you.

JOHN ABERLY

SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS IN A MODERN DRESS[1]

During the past two generations much has been heard about "value judgments," even in theology. Everyone knows what a large part this concept has played in Ritchlianism. Here is an attempt to define value in a philosophical sense and to describe its relations, not in a merely disinterested way but on the basis of the Roman and Thomistic standpoint.

In the first part of the book Fr. Ward discusses theories of value, and subjects many of them to rather well deserved ridicule. So great are the eccentricities of many of them that even the crass realism of Thomas Aquinas would be preferable. He pays his respects to quite a large group of philosophers, but with some strange omissions. Though there is a long bibliography at the end, which in section VI, Religious Value, mentions twenty-seven authors, there is no reference to Ristchl, for example, though one of his weakest pupils, Höffding, is mentioned.

The second part is the outline of a constructive theory of value, which, however, is not an original one, but a repristination of Thomas Aquinas. It is an excellent digest of this part of the great scholastic's philosophy presented in very readable form. Of course, with some of us it is a question as to whether this is the last word in philosophy, or whether something has not been learned since the days when our old friend, the ass between the two bundles of hay, was mercilessly left to starve to death. For example, it would seem that Kant's epistemology would have some bearing on the theory of reality, and that the thesis of a categorical imperative would have something to do with

1 *Philosophy of Value, An Essay in Constructive Criticism.* By Leo Richard Ward, C.S.C. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930. vii + 263 pages.

the whole theory of value; but Kant's existence is dismissed with one passing reference. There are just about 250 citations from Thomas Aquinas! The interesting thing about some of them is the way they occur. "St. Thomas says," and that settles the question. To all practical intents and purposes it does settle the question for those of the Roman obedience since Leo XIII in the Encyclical, *Aeterni patris,* Aug. 4, 1879, marked St. Thomas as the normative philosopher and theologian, and Pius X in the Motu Proprio, *Doctoris Angelici,* June 29, 1914, directed that the *Summa* should be the basis of theological and philosophical instruction in Italian schools. Even in philosophy we realize the force of the dictum, "Roma locuta, causa finita." In spite of the many excellencies of this book it raises the sad question as to what progress certain sciences can make under these conditions, or when the *Nihil Obstat* of the Censor and the *Imprimatur* of the Bishop is required before a venturesome author may express his opinions.

JOHN C. MATTES

A NEW STUDY OF LUTHER AS PREACHER

The versatile Luther from a different angle—that of preacher—is presented by Lic. Dr. Hermann Werdermann.[1] The book has three parts. The first gives differfent extracts from Luther's sermons on such important topics as public worship, confession, the Lord's Supper, offerings, taxes, parents and children, marriage, servants, discontent, avarice, alcohol, war, superstitions, etc. These are not connected sermons but striking extracts quoted from different sermons.

The second part treats of Luther's homiletical rules along similar lines: text, theme, divisions, introduction, conclusion, defense, making past events live, use of proverbs and illustrations, quotations, the use of church and secular history—all these are copiously illustrated from Luther's writings.

The third part deals with Luther's value to the preacher of the present. Here both form and matter are covered. With reference to matter one notices the emphasis on the Word of God. Luther, we are told, spoke more of the Gospel than of the Word of God. It is significant how much the school represented by Barth, that calls men back to the fact that the preacher is to be the mouthpiece through which the Word of God is proclaimed, quotes Luther in support of this position: "God's Word and human preaching do not exclude each other but include each other according to God's will and Luther's understanding of it" (p. 220). The incarnation is central in the preaching as in the teaching of Luther. In Luther's *manner* of preaching, his use of proverbs, his using the language of the people, and his personality, are extensively illustrated.

1 *Luthers Wittenberger Gemeinde wiederhergestellt aus seinen Predigten. Zugleich ein Beitrag zu Luthers Homiletik und zur Gemeindepredigt der Gegenwart.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929. 301 pages. 14 Marks.

The book is easy to read and exceedingly suggestive. It is another illustration of how modern, not modernistic, Luther was. It can not but be helpful to preachers in our day. In fact, here would be a good book for some one to translate and make available for the English reader.

JOHN ABERLY

THE COPENHAGEN CONVENTION[1]

In the opening sermon of this Convention, Bishop Ostenfeld of Copenhagen said, "The spiritual heritage can only be preserved by risking it, spending it to regain it through circulation." This record of the full proceedings of the Second Lutheran World Convention reveals the spirit of world-wide Lutheranism, presents a new evaluation of fundamentals, and shows how the leaders think it can be preserved by risking and regained by spending. The volume furnishes an official list of the delegates, a partial Who's Who of Lutheranism, the detailed program, reports of all committees and Convention action on all reports. Three reports are significant, that of the Committee on Resolutions, the Committee on Organization, and the Executive Committee. The last is especially valuable as it shows the work done by the Committee since the Eisenach Convention in 1923.

Perhaps of greater interest to the general reader will be the sermons and addresses. Some of these papers have already appeared in The Lutheran Church Quarterly. The addresses include a wide range of subjects by leaders of Lutheranism in the different countries. The tenor of the Convention is indicated in the consideration of Luther as a Christian personality, Luther's Catechism, the duty of transmitting our heritage, the inner awakening of the Lutheran church, Marburg and Augsburg, the relation between Christianity and the world, the message of Lutheranism to the world, relation to social problems, the development of inner unity among Lutheran churches, missionary problems, etc. The spirit and content of the sermons, the frank and courageous presentations in the addresses and the equally frank discussions, present a virile Lutheranism facing its tasks. The voices of Lutherans from various lands show a Lutheran world-consciousness filled with hope and courage. This volume, a sequel to the volume on the Eisenach Convention in 1923, deserves a wide distribution and a careful reading.

JOHN B. MOOSE

1 *The Second Lutheran World Convention.* By the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1930. $1.50.

A NEW HYMNAL[1]

This new hymnal challenges attention not only because it marks the entrance of a well-known publisher into the field of the general hymnals, but because of the principles which underlie the book, and because of the contents themselves. The publishers proclaim it "an original and powerful work." Its originality may be granted; its power remains to be demonstrated. It is worthy of study because it is a work of conviction and because its craftsmanship is creditable.

It is at once critical and constructive. By its omissions it protests against much that is commonplace and mediocre; by the large amount of fresh material it contains it invites the church to leave the highways of its own history and pluck blooms of song in the gardens of the great, and in forest and field where the folk songs of the nations grow.

We can only understand this book by recognizing it as an expression of personal taste. No church body has authorized it. In fact, the names of no responsible editors appear in connection with it. The publisher's announcement says it "is the work of a small group of theologians and musicians who have felt that hymn book making has fallen into stereotyped ruts, and that there is need of fresh and interesting material." It would be interesting to know just who these "theologians and musicians" are. But not knowing this we may at least see what they propose.

We naturally compare this new hymnal point by point with our own hymnal and with representative hymnals of other churches. We see at once that the principle determining its preparation is radically different from that which produced the church hymnals. In the Common Service Book, for instance, the basic principle was that of a consensus of usage, not only in our own church, but in the English-speaking world. Thus personal taste was subordinated to universal Christian experience and churchly use. In this new hymnal, texts and tunes that have had the widest usage have clearly been under the greatest suspicion. Great numbers of hymns and melodies found in practically all standard hymnals have been omitted and their place taken by novelties.

A scant half dozen translations from the Latin appear in the book. Of the lyrical and beautiful ones of John Mason Neale, only two are given. The Common Service Book has no less than 24, the Presbyterian Hymnal 21, and the Episcopal 33. Luther is represented by 2 hymns, and Gerhardt by 4, while our book has 7 and 15 respectively. Watts is represented by 11 hymns, while the Common Service Book has 25, and the Presbyterian 49. Charles Wesley, Montgomery and Heber have about half the number in the other hymnals. Ellerton is granted only one hymn as compared with 12 in the Common Service Book, 13 in the Presbyterian and 19 in the Episcopal. Our

1 *Immanuel Hymnal.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 580 hymns.

own American poets suffer also, particularly the New England group. Whittier is represented only by 2 hymns, and there is no place at all given to Holmes and Longfellow.

On the other hand Thomas H. Gill, the English Unitarian, has 6 hymns, and there are quite a few by writers associated with the Keswick Movement in England and by Christina Rosetti, Henry Van Dyke, Stuart Caeverly and others. Not all good poems are good hymns, however, and there are several examples of this kind in the collection.

But it is in the music of the book that we find its greatest departure from the conventional. There are no plain song melodies at all, and scarcely a half dozen German chorales. Every fifth tune in the book is new, that is, new to church hymnals. A large number of the best English, Scotch and American tunes are included, but often they are not found with the hymns with which they are commonly associated. It is as if the editor or editors had said "Go to, let us make a Hymnal, and because nearly all the English-speaking world sings St. Anne to 'Our God, Our Help in Ages Past,' let us set these words to Dundee; and since every one sings St. Chrysostom to 'Jesus, My Lord, My God, My All,' we shall use a new tune by Johann Petersen; and since Bishop Brooks' 'O Little Town of Bethlehem' is generally sung to the tune composed for it by the Bishop's organist, Lewis Redner, let us set it to the Danish Folk Song."

In fact, it seems that a studied effort has been made to avoid the use of tunes by the great church composers, the devout organists and musicians who lived and labored for the church and its services. Crueger has only two tunes as compared with 10 in the Common Service Book; Monk is represented by 6, as compared with 21 in the Common Service Book, and 23 in the Episcopal. Dykes appears 18 times, but he has 33 tunes in the Common Service Book and 41 in the Presbyterian Hymnal.

On the other hand Sullivan, with his light and lilting style, has 17 tunes as compared with 12 in the Common Service Book. An enormous number of tunes has been taken from Scandinavian composers scarcely represented in the usual church hymnals, e. g. Berggreen, with 9 tunes; Greig with 5; Lindemann with 5; J. P. E. Hartmann with 12; and Kjerulf with 3. In fact, the Scandinavian bias, or at least, trend, of the musical editor is very evident.

Two other sources of melody have been tapped. The great masters have been laid under heavy tribute by numerous adaptations from their works, e. g. Beethoven 6, Handel 5, Haydn 8, Mendelssohn 7, Mozart, Gounod, Donizetti and others. In the second place, the great body of folk song of all nations has been ransacked and every melody that could possibly fit a hymn has been given a place. Some of these are really excellent, but many others have secular associations which render their use in worship most questionable. Here we find the Welsh folk song "All Through the Night," the German "Lorelei," and the radio favorites, those two Irish traditionals, "Londonderry

Air" and "Drink to Me Only With Thine Eyes." Indeed there is a fine collection of folk songs from all over Europe as you might hope to find anywhere. No less than 13 of these are Norwegian, but folk songs from Austria, Bohemia, Denmark, England, Esthonia, Flanders, The Netherlands, Germany, Ireland, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Russia, Scotland and Wales are also there.

Most of these are of the strongly rhythmic type in three-four and six-eight time. Some are certainly far too light and tripping for the words they bear, as e. g., the Polish folk song "Vistula" which is set to Baker's translation from the Latin "Jesus, Grant Me This, I Pray," or the bright Norwegian "Romsdal," which is set to "Lord for Tomorrow and Its Needs." On the other hand some are exceedingly sombre and heavy, and a few carry the melody down to B♭ and even A, far too low for general congregational use.

These points seem to suggest inexperience on the part of the editors of this audacious hymnal. This impression is strengthened when we recognize the exceedingly large number of tunes given in the book, for there are no less than 520 different tunes for 580 hymns. In our hymnal, as well as in the general church hymnals, many tunes are repeated in the interest of congregational familiarity and use.

The book lacks an index of authors and composers. It is also without running heads with names of seasons or subjects, which not only serve a great practical purpose, but also lift the imagination above the dead monotony of a mere collection. The frequent placing of two hymns on a page, and of three or four lines of text between the staves gives a crowded and somewhat commercial feel to the book. The inclusion of 45 Gospel hymns as a separate group at the end is clearly a concession to popular taste, quite out of harmony with the high standards proclaimed by author and publishers.

The Immanuel Hymnal is an unusual and an interesting book. It is not a great hymnal. Great hymnals grow out of the life of the church. They mirror its deepest devotional experiences. We have here a good collection of religious verse, a selection made with taste and discrimination, and a very imperfect collection of historic chorales and hymn tunes, plus an unusual number of national folk songs and traditional airs. We do not believe that this hymnal will "win immediate favor among the churches," as the publishers predict. In fact we think it would be a great pity if it did.

LUTHER D. REED

MEASURING ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CHURCH[1]

During the past few decades much attention has been given to tests and measurements. In the physical field this has been comparatively easy, and

1 *The Measurement of Attitude.* By L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Chave. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929. 89 pages.

each new development has soon had a series of tests by which its characteristics were rated. This was necessary for scientific and commercial reasons.

The educational has a similar need. The percentage of failures and retardations has been entirely too large. This led to a search for causes which resulted in a study of intelligence. Instead of their falling into two classes it was found that pupils show a wide range of intelligence, rating from the idiot to the mentally brilliant. By the use of intelligence tests many new facts were revealed and many problems were brought within the range of solution. Pupils could be classified and given work they were able to do. This was profitable to the state in terms of dollars, and to the pupils in self-respect and increased effort.

Systems of measurement have reached a high degree of efficiency in many fields. And now we have a scheme for the measurement of attitudes. The work falls in the psychological field, and the authors are making "a series of experiments intended to continue the work of Cattell in applying the psychophysical methods to the measurement of social values." The present study seeks to discover what type of appeal will effectively influence or even change the mind of people who already have more or less fixed opinions on the subject before them. In this is involved the education, sex, occupation, etc., of the group. To discover the effectiveness of a given appeal the attitudes of the group must be mesaured before and after the appeal is made. The result compared with that of other similar appeals will be the basis for rating the effectiveness of the appeal.

But the question arises "how can we measure attitudes"? Dr. Thurstone says: "The very fact that one offers a solution to a problem so complex as that of measuring differences of attitude on disputed social issues makes it evident from the start that the solution is more or less restricted in nature and that it applies only under certain assumptions that will, however, be described. In devising a method of measuring attitude we have tried to get along with the fewest possible restrictions because sometimes one is tempted to disregard so many factors that the original problem disappears . . . ."

To get started, some common-sense assumptions are necessary. Every one will admit that an attitude is a complex affair. So is a table and engine, or a man. Yet each has some things about it or him that can readily be measured. "The context may well imply without explicit declaration what aspects of the man we are measuring, his cephalic index, his height, his weight, or what not. Just in the same sense we shall say here that we are measuring attitudes. We shall state or imply by the context the aspect of people's attitudes that we are measuring. The point is that it is just as legitimate to say that we are measuring attitudes as it is to say that we are measuring tables or men."

For this study "the concept 'attitude' will be used here to denote the sum

total of a man's inclinations and feelings, prejudices or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic." "The concept 'opinion' will mean a verbal expression of attitude. . . . . An opinion symbolizes an attitude." Since an "opinion has interest only in so far as we interpret it as a symbol of attitude" we may "use opinions as the means for measuring attitudes."

The scheme resorted to is to consider all opinions offered on a given subject as possible of being arranged on a straight line. These opinions are grouped according to their similarity, beginning at one end of the line with the extreme "pros" and running through to the extreme "cons" which come at the other end of the line. In the middle of the line is a neutral zone expressive of opinion neither way. Opinions thus grouped according to their number and intensity make possible the construction of a graph which can be measured with more or less accurate results. In arriving at an interpretation of these opinions we must consider "(1) the mean position that one occupies on the scale; (2) the range of opinions that he is willing to accept, and (3) that one opinion which he selects as the one which most nearly represents his own attitude on the issue at stake."

In constructing a scale for the measurement of attitudes toward the church a great many people and groups were asked to write opinions on the church. In editing the replies the following criteria were used: "(1) The statements should be as brief as possible so as not to fatigue the subjects who were asked to read the whole list. (2) The statements should be such that they can be endorsed or rejected in accordance with their agreement or disagreement with the attitudes of the reader. (3) Every statement should be such that acceptance or rejection of the statement does indicate something regarding the reader's attitude about the issue in question. (4) Double-barrelled statements should be avoided. (5) One must insure that at least a fair majority of the statements really belong on the attitude variable that is to be measured."

The result was 130 opinions about the church suitable for a place in the scale. These were duplicated and given to a large number of intelligent people to classify into eleven groups lettered from A to K, A to indicate the highest measure of appreciation and K the lowest. F would be the neutral group. It was made plain to the sorters that they were to classify the statements according to their place in the scale and not according to their personal opinions.

The results were tabulated and the scale-values determined graphically. The reliability of these scale-values has been approximatly determined. The scale was also examined for ambiguity and irrelevance, and the degree of possible error computed.

As a final check-up a carefully selected list of 45 statements of opinion was made from the original 130 opinions. This was submitted to several

hundred subjects for their expression of opinion. This was made by checks on statements expressing their own sentiment toward the church.

The scale thus constructed was given to 889 students of the University of Chicago, 210 graduate students, 103 divinity students, and 181 members of the Chicago Forum. The results show little change of attitude of college men during their progress through college. As might be expected Catholics show strongly favorable attitudes toward the church, and the Jews show indifference or antagonism. Protestants are in between. The results also show that women are slightly more favorable to the church than men. It was also found that over 50% of the freshmen, 36.7% of the sophomores, 42.7% of the juniors, 45.2% of the seniors and 46% of the graduate students attend church frequently. It should be kept in mind that this was a rather select group and that applied to a mill group, a group of clerks, or a group engaged in other forms of manual toil, music, art, amusement producers, etc., might get very different results. Yet the method is reasonably valid no matter what the results may be. Applied to an individual, a fairly dependable measure of his attitude toward the church can be secured.

While the authors do not consider the scale perfect they do feel that highly satisfactory results are attainable by its use. "The number of hearty endorsements of the church was rather surprisingly large and was well distributed among men and women, and across the different religious groupings. The results seem to show a real longing for greater assurance as to the realities of religion, while a wide variety of criticism against the church was frankly stated." It all goes to show the church its elements of strength and weakness. These rightly understood and appreciated, the church can develop technics by which attitudes of indifference or even of antagonism may be turned to attitudes of respect and support. Drs. Thurstone and Chave have made a real contribution to an intelligent study of the attitudes of people toward the church. Similar studies for junior and intermediate children would meet a real need in fixing right attitudes during the great active, formative periods of life, by placing in the hands of church teachers an instrument for the intelligent direction of building for character and citizenship.

M. Hadwin Fischer

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Book of Isaiah (Chapters I-XXXIX)—In the Light of the Assyrian Monuments. By Charles Boutflower, M.A. New York: Macmillan Co., 1930. xxiv + 364 pages. $6.50.

Those who have read Mr. Boutflower's *In and Around the Book of Daniel* are prepared to find in this book on Isaiah "something different" from the other books on the great prophet of Judah whose prophetic career stretched throughout the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah. The author rightly felt that Isaiah the nationalist could be checked on closely by the wealth of Assyrian inscriptions which we possess from Tiglathpileser III, Sargon and Sennacherib, and his studies have led him to the conclusion that the whole of chapters 1-39 falls within the period of the prophet's life and emanates from none other than Isaiah himself. Even chapters 24-27, which are now commonly assigned to post-exilic days, are no exception. The author finds in these chapters the prophetic dreamings of the prophet Isaiah in his old age. The peculiarities of style—"a threefold variation of phrase, a characteristic repetition of words, and a fondness for rhymned endings and for accumulated alliterations"—which even such conservative critics as Whitehouse have looked upon as "indications of a later style," Mr. Boutflower turns into the characteristic utterance of Isaiah the aged dreaming over his earlier visions. He finds a background for all the references in the Assyrian, the Egyptian or the Babylonian age. One cannot deny the resourcefulness of the author, whether or not satisfied with his findings.

Mr. Boutflower reads Isaiah with his New Testament in his hand, and, being a stout evangelical, does not hesitate to point out the remarkable fulfilments of the prophet's words in the Gospel records. In 25:6 he sees in "the feast of fat things"—a figure of the peace-offering—to which Jehovah is inviting all peoples, not Jews only, the Lord's Supper. "With the New Testament in our hands how easily can we see what it all means! At Jerusalem will be offered the Great Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world." This is ultimate truth, but it is here injected in an attempt to recover the historical setting.

The author's independence in interpretation is likewise shown in his handling of chapter 14. Tiglathpileser is the great tyrant whose descent to Sheol occasioned the great commotion there, for says the author, "there were Chaldeans before the times of Nebuchadnezzar, and Medes before the days of Cyrus," and in an inscription of 727 B. C. Tiglathpileser is actually called "the king of Babylon."

Another instance. The "Immanuel" of 7:14 is the prophet's own son, and the maiden who became his mother was the prophet's second wife. Isaiah's first wife was the mother of Shear-jashub. When the prophet, at Jehovah's command, took Shear-jashub with him and went to meet Ahaz, his first wife was dead. After the birth of Immanuel this young woman, now the prophet's wife, is called "the prophetess." She was the mother of two children with prophetic names. The author thinks that within a year or two of Immanuel's birth Isaiah must have left Jerusalem for a time, the reason being the hostility of Ahaz, and gone to live in the now desolated land of Israel. One thing seems clear from the prophetic utterances of this section, namely, that Immanuel is to share the desolation caused by the *Assyrian* invasion. He believes that the prophet withdrew into that part of the land which suffered most from that invasion, namely, Galilee, and that at his departure he wrote the tablet (8:1), which he left behind as a witness. This also was "for a sign."

The author's method is rigidly evangelical. The value of the book is its wealth of Assyrian citations, a careful study of which will lead to some revision of the assured results of Isaianic study. As a handbook it can prove very helpful. It is profusely illustrated.

H. C. Alleman

Experience With the Supernatural in Early Christian Times. By Shirley Jackson Case. New York: The Century Co., 1929. 340 pages. $3.00.

Those acquainted with Dr. Case's *Jesus—A New Biography* will find this new book written along the same lines. It collects from a very wide acquaintance with the literature of those early times a large number of facts that show that the supernatural entered into the thinking of men of that age from every side. To one who has lived among an oriental people, it would seem rather unnecessary to labor this point. The author shows how this belief in the supernatural is shown in their visions of spirits, their resorting to magic and interpreting portents, and especially in their belief in redeemer heroes—among whom he would place Jesus. Men resorted to sacrifice, worship and ritual to tap the supernatural. The gods were the supernatural protectors of the state and so there grew up state religions, and when death faced them they implored and believed in the supernatural to give them help beyond the grave. The bearing of all this on early Christian beliefs is suggested rather than expressed. It is that Christianity has been living on a perpetuation of this belief in the supernatural instead of letitng it disappear before the advances of a scientific age.

One may question the inferences intended to be drawn. Fortunately or unfortunately, there are still people among whom belief in the supernatural enters into every relation of life. One fails however to see that it has ever shown any such creative power as we are compelled by the facts of history to ascribe to Jesus. What the historians, it would seem to the outsider, ought to explain is not the similarities of the early Christian history to such other situations, but rather, how, with such striking similarities, the differences are no less decidedly pronounced. The impression that a trip to Palestine gave to the reviewer—and I believe to many another—is that Jesus can not be explained by Palestine. One questions whether the illustrations in this volume can explain him. Having lived among a people whose philosophy is based on the illusory character of everything, experience and history included, and having seen its utter impracticability and impotence, I prefer to follow another historian of no mean order, Dr. T. R. Glover, in his statement: "The cynical view that delusion and error in a real world have a peculiar power in human affairs may be dismissed. No serious student of history can hold it."

John Aberly

The Christ of Every Road. By E. Stanley Jones. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1930. 271 pages. $1.50.

This book is a study in Pentecost. In the opening chapter the author expresses his belief that the world is on the verge of a great spiritual awakkening. He gives his reassons for that conviction. He believes the church today is standing behind closed doors, that it is in the period between Easter and Pentecost, that it has not yet appropriated spiritual life in its fulness and begun to witness as it should to an adequate way of living. The lost chord in our present day Christianity is the spirit of Pentecost. We need to find that spirit if our modern Christian life is to be vitalized.

He then gives a keen analysis of what actually happened when the Holy Spirit came. There are fourteen chapters in which Pentecost is studied in its relation to the modern problems of our religious, social, and economic life. He shows how the presence of the

Spirit will help in our solution of them. The book has twenty-five chapters all written in the charming, lucid style of this famous missionary. One cannot read this book without realizing in a challenging way, some of the weaknesses of the church of our day, and that a return to the spirit and temper of Pentecost is needed. Those whose thinking has been stimulated by the other books of E. Stanley Jones will welcome this one.

EARL J. BOWMAN

The Holy Spirit. By Raymond Calkins. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1930. 228 pages. $1.50.

The author, who is pastor of the First Congregational Church of Cambridge, Mass., believes that "the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is one of the most neglected aspects of Christian theology." He claims that "perhaps the greatest need of Christian thinking at the present time is a fresh discovery and interpretation of the truth of the Holy Spirit, alike in its theological implications, in the corporate life of the church, and in personal experience." In the sphere of practical piety he pleads for a fresh discovery of the Holy Spirit. In a way that is clearly expressed, attractively presented, and that is evangelical in its interpretation of Scripture, he shows how that need may be met. The book is not a formal, doctrinal discussion of the Holy Spirit. It is a practical study of the Spirit and his work.

There are ten chapters under the following headings: The Dispensation of the Spirit, The Baptism of the Spirit, The Catholicity of the Spirit, The Church of the Spirit, The Language of the Spirit, The Power of the Spirit, The Witness of the Spirit, The Life of the Spirit, The Comfort of the Spirit, and The Fire of the Spirit. Pastors will find this a stimulating book.

EARL J. BOWMAN

The Making and Meaning of the Augsburg Confession. By Conrad Bergendoff, Ph.D. Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Book Concern, 1930. 128 pages. 75 cents.

Lutherans all over the world are celebrating this year the four hundredth anniversary of the appearance of the Augsburg Confession. Much is being said and written about the generic creed of Protestantism. Dr. Bergendoff's little volume is the literary contribution of the Augustana Synod to the celebration.

The story of the "Making of the Confession" is briefly and clearly told. It covers less than twenty-five pages. It is a narrative of the events leading up to the diet of 1530 and the presentation of the Confession rather than a study of the documents that were used in fashioning the Confession. There are ten pages of interesting illustrations.

Most of the volume is occupied with a commentary, article by article, on the Confession itself. This discussion of the "meaning of the Confession" embraces only the doctrinal articles. The articles reviewing the abuses that have been corrected are set down without comment. The comments on the several doctrinal articles are necessarily brief, but they are full enough to give the thoughtful layman a fairly clear idea of the teaching of the Confession on the various points. One could wish that Dr. Bergendoff, with his clear style and his positive understading of Lutheran theology, had expanded his volume to include some interpretation of the Confession as a whole and some discussion of our present-day mode of subscription to creeds. But even as it stands the volume will serve our pastors and laymen to renew their acquaintance with the principal confession of their church.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen. Ed. D. Erich Stange. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1929. 251 pages.

Here is the fifth, and last, of these delightful volumes of autobiographies. We read with real regret the statement of the editor in the preface that this is the last of the series, at least for the present.

Like the preceding volumes there are exceedingly illuminating portrayals of various phases of modern theology and delightful glimpses into the development of great scholars: a development that in most cases again shows a progress into a stronger, more positive and deeper faith. Each has its human interest as well as its historic value and it is hard to choose between most of them. This volume contains the autobiographies of Martin Dibelius, Paul Feine, Ferdinand Kattenbusch, Emil Walter Mayer, Willie Staerk and Paul Wernle. Everyone who wants to understand some of the very newest tendencies in German theology as they have been revealed in the past generation should read this whole series of five volumes.

JOHN C. MATTES

The Science of Psychology. An Introductory Study. By R. H. Wheeler. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1929. 556 pages; 68 illustrations. $3.75.

This textbook offers a splendid opportunity of reviewing the results of investigation upon which a science of Psychology must be built. Its five hundred and more pages include table, charts, bibliographies and an index. It presents to the lay reader the most recent and authoritative data in a form which requires no special training for its mastery.

But the book is more than a textbook. It organizes the data about principles which invite the attention and deliberation of mature thought. The odor of the sick room and the cry of the iconoclast, so common to the literature of Psychology in the past decade, has given place to the interest of a balanced understanding.

Professor Wheeler counters the bias of the American point of view by principles derived from the Gestalt Psychology. The whole determines the functioning of its parts and "action including behavior, is directed by a remote end which is established before action begins." With such principles of organization the data of Psychology need not lead to the fruitless antagonisms of individual versus society, the subjective versus the objective.

The text aims at a presentation free from philosophical presuppositions. This aim is furthered by helpful indications of the history of terms such as "attention" or "instinct." The treatment of the problems lying behind such terms assists the reader to discount special emphases which may become tacit in the choice of words.

The book is not light reading. The author believes that the newer psychology texts err on the side of too great simplicity and brevity. While he presents a simple formula, the configurational principle, he applies this formula in details that can only be followed by those willing to make an effort of thought. The reward of such effort will more than compensate for its expenditure. One cannot escape the sense of dealing with ideas which connect up the facts of Psychology with those of broader fields of knowledge.

Too often Psychology has in our day taken to itself a rôle which appears not unlike a substitute for religion, a rival to the specialist in religion. It has been difficult for such a specialist to avail himself of the contributions of the psychologist without in some degree apologizing for his own speciality. One of the virtues of Professor Wheeler's book is the absence of arrogance and the businesslike provision of fact and theory for just what they are and no more. *The Science of Psychology* lives up to its title.

J. S. BOUGHTON

Psychology in the Service of the Soul. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. New York: Macmillan Co., 1930. 219 pages. $2.00.

Here is another contribution to a very interesting field of study and practice. For many years the pastor has been called on to deal with people who were mentally ill. Mental health is important in normal religious life. The modern pastor is being prepared to deal with mild cases of ill health, and by proper instruction is given at least an orientation in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. This field may be named Pastoral Psychology. Treatises have been written by medical authorities, by psychologists and psychiatrists. This book is by a clergyman who has trained himself as a psychiatrist. It approaches the simple methods of psychotherapy from the standpoint of the Christian religion. Most of the books on the subject of mental health approach it from the materialistic viewpoint. The volume has the endorsement of able medical authority. There are some very valuable chapters: Value of Confession; Cure of Impure Thoughts; Fear and Funk, etc. The problem a pastor faces is to prepare himself to deal wisely with pathological cases and avoid the mistake of entering the realm of the psychiatrist or physician. This book is a valuable help.

H. D. Hoover

Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology. By Pitirim Sorokin and Carle C. Zimmerman. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1929. 652 pages. $3.60.

This volume is one of the American Social Science Series, edited by Dr. Howard W. Odum. The volumes which are admitted to this series are authoritative and superior texts. The treatment of the subject commends itself to the thoughful student. Dealing with the urban and rural populations together helps to clear away many false assumptions, "grounds" for conflict between country and town, and persistent fallacies. The conclusions in the book are reached only after a careful consideration of data gathered from almost all countries in the civilized world. The author's treatment of the subject calls for careful thinking on the part of the student. It is a genuinely usable text-book. No student of rural sociology—and what minister or teacher is not included in that category —can afford to be without this volume.

H. D. Hoover

Small Towns. An Estimate of Their Trade and Culture. By Walter Burr. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 267 pages. $2.50.

This compact volume deals with a large number of important phases of the town. From the chapter on the Pioneer American Community to a Community Forecast, the matter and manner of presentation awaken the deepest interest in the mind of the reader. The subjects presented are intensely practical and helpful. For example all of us want to know about such things as: Community Population Problem; Importance of Community Institutions; Adult Education; the Church in the New Community; and New Community Factors that Condition the Coming Type of Church. Of course it does not say it all. To the content of this book one might well add several chapters (e. g.) from Dr. Sim's *Elements of Rural Sociology* such as the Country Village and Planned Communities. Dr. Burr's timely volume will help villagers to know themselves and help them to solve their pressing problems.

H. D. Hoover

Community Leadership. By Walter Burr. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1929. 304 pages. $2.50.

This is an exceedingly valuable book for the rural and village church pastor. Prof. Burr is teacher of rural sociology in the University of Missouri. This work is useful for training leadership in the rural community, and as a guide to develop oneself into the technique of leadership. It contains valuable contributions from more than a score of leading students of social problems. But it is not a disjointed collection of opinions. The author has written ten valuable chapters presenting an orderly development in a progressive readable style. The importance of the work may be indicated by the following selected chapter headings: the World Vision; Community Consciousness; Understanding Backward Groups; Training the Followers; Coöperation Among Leaders. A thoughtful study of the book will give new vision and strength to the rural worker. It will breed self-confidence in the heart of the agriculturist. It should help to awaken or restore the self-respect of the farmer.

H. D. Hoover

The Christian Life. By Joseph Stump, President of Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary. New York: Macmillan Co., 1930. 308 pages. $2.50.

Dr. Stump, a number of years ago, prepared the book on "Bible Teachings" for the Lutheran Graded Series of Sunday School Lessons. The second half of that volume dealt with subjects pertaining to the Christian life. Since that time the author has occupied positions in several seminaries that required him to teach the subject of Christian Ethics. The volume under review gives the reading public the opportunity to follow these lectures.

Though not so closely as the former book, this volume still follows the Scriptures so closely that it might be called a Biblical ethics. In this it differs from those systems which, making the Scriptures, and especially the New Testament, the starting point for the development of the Christian conscience, rather make that conscience as enlightened and sanctified by God's Spirit, the norm for Christian ethics. Nor does the author spend much time on the various ethical problems that evolutionary ethics, ethical relativity, "high religion," etc., compel the student in our time to face. The apologetics of ethics are not stressed. Rather is the method the positive one that presents Christian teaching and then allows the Christian precepts themselves to be their own vindication. While one who is called on to teach Christian ethics could have wished for a more detailed discussion of these pressing problems, much is to be said in favor of such a presentation of the subject as the author has given. Positive Christian teaching is its own best evidence. The way in which the ethics of the Scriptures not only apply to all our various problems but, if faithfully followed, would also lead to their solution, gives one confidence that they are still the infallible rule of practice. If it be said that the author can maintain this only by a judicious selection from the Scriptures, instead of taking them all from the beginning to the end, such a selection is justified by the Scriptures themselves. Christ is the end of the law. He summarized it for the Christian in his own new commandment. Estimating the volume thus, it meets a real need of both student and teacher in summarizing clearly and positively what are the requirements of the Christian life.

John Aberly

Love That Lasts. By Samuel Miller. Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Book Concern, 1929. 112 pages. Art cover $1.00; cloth $2.00.

Every pastor will find *Love That Lasts* a source of suggestion in dealing with the try-

ing problems that have to be faced by young people. Many of our youth have an idea that parents are either obsolete or antique when it comes to matters of social conduct in these fast moving days. Yet among them there is a sane desire to know just what is the right thing to do in matters of courtship and the engagement that follows. The informed pastor can do much to direct his young people into wholesome channels and make himself their friend and confidant for life.

Love That Lasts is the story of how one pastor met the needs of his young folks. He undertook to answer the questions raised to a small group. This group grew in numbers very fast as other young people got to know about it. The book deals with the fundamentals of love from the intelligent, sympathetic viewpoint of a pastor. Some pastors will object to the position taken on the lodge question, but honest seekers for help in the social field will heartily welcome the sound scriptural method used by the pastor in helping young people meet the problem of selecting a mate and building the home.

M. H. Fischer

The King's Garden. By John Hemler Olson. Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Book Concern, 1929. 124 pages. $1.00.

The King's Garden is an attractive little book that will be very helpful to teachers of Luther's Catechism. The text used is that of the Intersynodical Committee. The book is attractively bound, printed on good paper, and well illustrated. The treatment follows the story form. First the question is asked. This is answered and illustrated by a well-selected story that carries its own argument. The book is sure to be helpful to workers with children and young people.

M. H. Fischer

Humane Religion. By Frank Kingdon. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1930. 350 pages. $2.50.

The science of apologetics has dropped the defensive method. This book is another illustration of the constructive method of refutation. Humanism has rendered a service in becoming the occasion of this interpretation of Christianity. The book is Christocentric and could be used as devotional reading. In the first section the ethical objective of the Bible, of Christ and the church is presented as a passion for the sacredness of human life. "The Old Testament is as clearly the story of man's discovery of man as it is of his unfolding discovery of God." In the second section the author attempts to show that every new contribution to thought by the philosophers of history has proceeded from enriched human consideration. The third section develops the thesis that the best solution for modern problems is the one which has the "most regard for human welfare."

H. D. Hoover

A Manual on Worship. By Paul Zeller Strodach. With an Introduction by the Rev. F. H. Knubel, D.D., LL.D. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1930. 237 pages. $2.50.

This remarkably complete manual is an indispensable guide to ministers who would use properly the liturgy and forms authorized by the United Lutheran Church. It is a valuable contribution to literature on worship. The book itself reflects the author's accurate and complete knowledge of liturgical history and church usage. It gives a clear answer to all kinds of inquiries concerning the forms of worship: what, how, when, where and why. Not only should it be studied by every minister, organist and chorister, but

should find a place in the library of every church. In other words its minimum circulation should coincide with the figures: ministers, 3,413; congregations, 5,515; organists, 5,000; choristers, (cira) 3,000.

H. D. Hoover

Worship in Music. By Bishop Hughes et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1929. 204 pages. $1.50.

Worship in Music comes to us as series eleven of the Mendenhall Lectures delivered at De Pauw University. It is the report of the following lectures: 1. Music and Religion; 2. Music and Theology; 3. Music and Worship, by Bishop Hughes; 4. Music in the Church Service, by Robert McCutchan; 5. Hymns and Public Worship, by Peter Christian Lutkin; 6. The Order of Worship, by President Earl Enyeart Harper; 7. The Cosmopolitan Hymnal, by Carl F. Price; 8. Some New Anthems, by Karl P. Harrington; 9. Choirmasters and Their Choirs, by Lutkin, and 10. The Music Committee, by John M. Walker.

While the manuscript was prepared for a Methodist audience it contains much valuable information for Lutheran readers. In fact not a little of the hymn and anthem material listed is from Lutheran sources. Dr. F. Melius Christiansen of the Saint Olaf Choir is largely quoted and his methods are highly commended. The work of Dr. John Finly Williamson, director of the famous Westminster Choir, is also fittingly recognized.

Bishop Hughes pleads for proper respect for the musical portions of public worship. Sometimes the preacher is at fault by treating the voluntary as though it were a thing apart from the worship service. As a matter of fact the preacher seldom talks on the ministry of music. He will talk on practically everything else. He will discuss church attendance, prayer, the means of grace, etc., not forgetting to emphasize the grace of giving; but seldom, if ever, does he discuss the place of instrumental music or the worship through song in the regular service of the church. Yet much of whatever worship there is is influenced by song.

In connection with worship the Bishop calls attention to the appeal of the church. He asks: "Why do people not go to church? Perhaps a more profitable question would be the positive one rather than the negative one—Why do so many people go to church? In the average community the Lyceum Course does not have a long life. Even in the days when the platform claimed much of the time of Beecher, Gough and Nye, and in the sometime later time when Willits was scattering rays of his own 'Sunshine,' or Conwell was directing audiences toward 'Acres of Diamonds' the lecture course would run for about three years and then die a natural death. But is it not a significant thing that down over many centuries the Church of Christ has been maintaining its services, and that on this last Sunday it started through the streets of our towns and cities a larger procession than could be inspired by any other movement? Weekly some force pulls these millions of souls toward an agreed place of meeting. No other institution in the history of the race has been able to do that continuously and on so large a scale."

Worship is far from entertainment. Worship brings satisfaction to the hungry soul. In its outreach the souls will spontaneously break forth into melody, if not into both words and melody. No wonder we sing with awe, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts." To make this the more natural and spontaneous our church architecture should make provision for its expression. He says: "Just now there is a wide return to ecclesiastical architecture which seeks to give the mood of eternity and to make itself a call to worship. We are feeling acutely that there is a difference between a theatre and a sanctuary, between a town hall and a church. We may well give glad welcome to this reform. In doing this we should not make light of the place of preaching in the scheme

for the world's redemption, nor should we yield to the idolatry of a mere building. Yet the emphasis on worship is sure to have its influence on building plans. If you stress the teaching relation of the church toward the young, architecture soon shows the effect; and if you stress the worshipping element, the sanctuaries over the continent begin to respond. In one sense it may be said that a church building is a failure unless it brings you immediately to some reverent act." Certainly it should help us draw on the great musical ministries of the past. "Music can have no higher function than this—of taking its large and persuasive place in the program of God's holy temple and of thus preparing us for that city in which the seer beholds 'no sanctuary' simply because the habit of worship has so trained the heart that all the world becomes 'Bethel,' the house of God."

Attention is called to the place of music in the Reformation. While popular in form it was far from the tinkling ditties that so often are thought to be music. Luther was not interested in such light, frothy stuff. He wanted something that sang into the heart the great things he stood for. He was said to have won more converts to his cause by his hymns than he did by his preaching. Hymns that come through the crucible remain to comfort and strengthen long after the trial has past. Thus the great hymns remain a heritage of the past and an inspiration of the present.

As might be expected the chapter on the Order of Worship adds little that is new to Lutheran or Episcopal leaders. Liturgical churches are rich in Orders of Worship and to them we must look for those great stirring selections that live through the centuries. They also produce the great hymns that endure both criticism and age, and through succeeding generations help men find fellowship with God.

The closing lectures deal with the practical side of church music. Dr. Lutkin feels that choir leaders should be called "Assistants to the Minister in charge of Music." He also feels that organists and choirmasters should sign contracts stating specifically their duties. Certainly the process might help more people to appreciate the importance of musical leadership. In some localities the choirmaster has changed the character not only of the church but of the community. Saint James Episcopal Church of Chicago is a case in point. This was possible because there were the means for carrying on. Yet even churches of small means can do much to build up a musical appreciation when pastor and choirmaster work together in the interest of real worship.

M. Hadwin Fischer

Progress and Prospects in Christian Reunion. By the Rev. Percy Varney Norwood, A.M., B.D. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1930. 44 pages (paper bound).

Bishop Hale by his will provided for the annual preaching of the Hale Memorial Sermon at Western Theological Seminary, now located at Evanston, Illinois. This pamphlet contains the fifteenth annual Hale Memorial Sermon. The text of the sermon is Eph. 5:27. The contents are a true development of the subject. The author tells what the Anglican church has done toward a reunion of the Christian church. A Lutheran would be interested in his reference to the "gifted William Augustus Muhlenberg" and his connection with the "Memorial" to the House of Bishops in 1853; and in the statement: "Both the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles of Religion were obviously influenced by Lutheran formularies"; and again, "More than once Elizabeth intervened to shield the Calvinists against the anathemas of Lutheran hyper-dogmatism." The sermon presents a rather remarkable picture of progress. Within such limits it is difficult to represent adequately the work of the Episcopal church. Regarding prospects, the Rev. Prof. Norwood admits that "Further approaches to Rome are obviously futile until she becomes 'other than she is.'" But he wisely counsels that we "utilize the measure of unity already attained in the common prosecution of the church's social missions." He

is hopeful for reunion in view of what has been accomplished in this direction on the mission field. He stresses the value and responsibility of continuing the educational work begun. And, what is perhaps most significant, he stresses the need of his own communion to pursue diligently a careful and scholarly study of the history of ordination and the doctrine of the church.

H. D. Hoover

New Frontiers of Physics. By Paul R. Heyl. (New World of Science Series). New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1930. 180 pages; bibliography and index. $2.00.

For the forward looking individual who desires to keep abreast of the latest cosmological tendencies, yet, like most of us, is unable to wander through the processes of laboratory experiments and the mazes of mathematical calculations, Heyl's descriptive little *New Frontiers of Physics* will be worth while. The book gives a sketchy survey of the older theories held up to thirty years ago and then proceeds with somewhat greater detail to set forth the experiments with the atom which eventually produce the quantum theory. Naturally enough the author takes up non-Euclidean geometry, gravitation and cosmology, and verges into Einstein's famous theory. One proud contention of the author is that physical theory is now providing other sciences with their own working tools.

In addition to providing the very latest "frontiers" on the experimentation line of the physicists, the book is interesting to the minister because of the academic human interest equation. For instance on page 93: "Inconceivability is a matter of small moment to the mathematician. All that counts with him is consistency." Would the disciples of theorems, formula and figures agree that inconceivability is a matter of small moment when a finite mind confronts an infinite personality?

It is interesting to see physicists speculating on free will and determinism on the basis of the "world lines" in four dimensional space. Likewise interesting is it to see scientific men taken over the coals for being dogmatic and then to read this statement on page 144, in which scientific optimism certainly does not back down for modesty: ".... physical theory, broadening, mellowing, and daily showing itself richer in possibilities, may some day rise to its opportunities as the fundamental science, and perhaps show itself capable of including among the phenomena for which it attempts to account even that of life itself." What will the dogmatically tempered biological chemist say? What will the personalistic philosopher answer?

Two points must be remembered by the theological mind. One is that when the scientist speaks of the drift away from materialism he means "the replacing of matter by energy as a fundamental entity." The second is that "scientific monism" is more alive today than it has ever been since the day of Democritus. However, the author does not believe that Einstein has succeeded in reducing the riddle of the universe to one scientifically monistic principle. A greater than Einstein must yet appear. Nevertheless, scientific optimism prophesies him. "It is not admitted that present failure demonstrates future impossibility."

According to Dr. Gruber's reasonings on the origin of the universe and on the metaphysical implications of Einstein's theory, the universe is more and more shown to be finite and temporal, and indefiniteness is not infinity. On that score what the scientists are doing is to write by implication what Kepler said: "O God, I think Thy thoughts after Thee." And on that score no man need be afraid of his faith. Let scientific optimism persevere!

Carroll J. Rockey

The Bible Through the Centuries. By Herbert L. Willett. New York: Willett, Clark & Colby, 1930. 337 pages. $3.00.

Dr. Willett in this excellent compendium shows how the Bible came to be and how it is related to the life of the people who wrote it. He traces the formation of the Old Testament and New Testament canons and sets forth the aim and method of biblical criticism, both textual and historical. His chapter on "Israel and the Monuments" illustrates the method by which the facts of ancient life are gradually brought to bear upon the interpretation of the Bible. The chapter on "Other Sacred Books" will assist those whose amateur acquaintance with the results of the study of comparative religions has disturbed their confidence in the Christian Scripture. While insisting that one "need not dispraise the other holy writings to perceive the greatness of our own," Dr. Willett says: "Yet the more they are studied and the more their writings are compared with those of our Bible the more we are impressed with the unique character of the Scriptures which have issued from the hands of Hebrew and Christian prophets and which find their highest levels in the utterances of our Lord" (pp. 218-19). In discussing the inspiration and authority of the Bible, he cuts beneath all superficial theories of its origin and nature: "The authority of the Bible is the authority of the supreme Life of which it speaks. And linked with it are all the other forceful lives in that same group, in the measure in which they make to the reader the appeal of character and teaching. For this reason the authority of the Bible cannot be formal, arbitrary or capricious. It cannot consist in oracular words and phrases. It cannot inhere in rules of living. These all may have value, but the power of the Bible in human life lies in its ability to inspire in those whom it really reaches a principle of thought and life which makes them a law unto themselves. Out of the best that the prophets and apostles have spoken one may organize a norm of living which becomes compelling. To him the character and message of the Lord become final. He has in some competent measure the mind of Christ. Within the enlightened and loyal soul itself there is set up a standard of ethics and religion to which the appeal of every decision must be referred" (pp. 296-7).

R. T. Stamm

Einführung in die Psychotherapie für Pfarrer. (Auf individualpsychologischer Grundlage.) Joh. Neumann. Unter Mitarbeit von M. H. Göring, F. Kölli, F. Künkel, K. Lenzberg, A. Römer, J. B. Schairer, K. Weinmann. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1930. 350 pages. 14 M.

The first volume of a series entitled "Studien über Aufbau und Führung des Charakters und des religiösen Lebens," edited by Joh. Neumann, Giessen. A statement in the preface will indicate the purpose: "If we desire a new race which shall be spiritual and hence healthier socially, we need new educators, and we ourselves must be changed. Prophylaxis, or physical hygiene, is to be added to therapeutics. This is the duty of all, a duty from which none can be absolved. It is a task in which, above all others, religion and its professional representatives must coöperate."

Psychologische Seelsorge. Handreichung eines Artzes. Dr. H. March. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1930. 145 pages. 5, 50 M. geb. 7 M.

The attempt of a physician to translate the language of medicine and medical psychology into that of the pastor, to whom it may still be foreign, and thereby to promote fruitful mutual understanding. Among the subjects discussed are "Sickness and Sin" and "The Body-Soul Problem in Its Relation to the Christian Faith."

Willst du gesund werden? Heilseelsorgerische Vorträge für seelisch Leidende. G. Diettrich. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929. 176 pages. 5, 50 M.

A practical demonstration of the possibility of combining psycho-therapeutic measures with gospel methods of pastoral care.

Religion and Conduct. Edited by George H. Betts, F. C. Eiselen and George A. Coe. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1930. 288 pages.

The report of a conference held at Northwestern University, Nov. 15-16, 1929. The subjects were: Religion as Motive in Conduct; Personal and Institutional Aspects of Religion; Influence of Social Environment on Conduct; Therapeutic Value of Religion; Research in the Dynamics of Religion; Strength and Weakness of a Program of Character Education that Omits Religion.

BRUNNER, H. EMIL, *The Theology of Crisis.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929. 118 pages. $1.75.

BURNS, VINCENT GODFREY, *The Red Harvest: The Poet's Cry for Peace.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930. 433 pages. $3.75.

ENSLIN, MORTON SCOTT, *The Ethics of Paul.* New York Harper & Brothers, 1930. 335 pages. $4.00.

FISHER, FREDERICK, B., *Personology: The Art of Creative Living.* New York: The Abingdon Press, 1930. 212 pages. $1.50.

GEWEHR, WESLEY M., *The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790.* N. C.: Duke University Press, 1930. 292 pages. $4.00.

GRAEBNER, THEO., *A Brief Story of the Augsburg Confession.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1930. 48 pages.

GRENSTED, L. W., *The Atonement in History and Life.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929. 340 pages. $3.50.

HALL, FRANCIS J., *Christian Reunion in Ecumenical Light.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930. 150 pages.

JONES, RUFUS M., *George Fox, Seeker and Friend.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1930. 224 pages. $2.00.

LENSKI, GERHARD E., *My Savior.* (A Series of Lenten Meditations and Prayers). Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publishing House. 1930. 92 pages. 75c.

MOFFATT, JAMES, *Love in the New Testament.* New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1930. 333 pages. $3.00.

NIEBUHR, H. RICHARD, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., Inc., 1929. 304 pages. $2.50.

OXNAM, G. BROMLEY (ed.), *Creative Preaching. A Series of Lectures Delivered before the Boston School of Theology, October 14, 15, and 16, 1929.* New York: The Abingdon Press, 1930. 347 pages. $2.50.

VAUGHAN, RICHARD M., *The Significance of Personality.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930. 302 pages. $2.50.